AFRICAN STUDIES
(Formerly Bantu Studies)
VOLUME 19, No. 4, 1960

THE GROWTH OF COMPARATIVE BANTU PHILOLOGY

C. M. DOKE

Although work upon individual Bantu languages had been carried on by Catholic priests during the seventeenth century both on the Eastern and Western coasts of Africa, the researches were independent of one another, and there is little evidence of any comparison being made at that time between these diverse types of Bantu. One reference, however, is worth noting. **Andrea Corsali,** after a voyage from Lisbon to India, wrote from Cochin (in India) in 1515 to the Medici in Italy[1] a letter containing the following statement:[2] "The terra firma is inhabited by a savage race of people, as is the whole coast from the streights of the Red Sea as far as the Cape of Good Hope, and they are all of the same language; and from the Cape of Good Hope as far as the Cape de Verde Islands, they speak a different language." Obviously he is really contrasting East Africa with Guinea coast, there being no evidence that he visited Kongo or Angola.

During the eighteenth century, however, there were repeated references in Portuguese writings to the similarities between the speech of Angola and that of Moçambique. Lack of interest in the languages of Africa at this time was pointedly referred to by **L'Abbé Proyart** in his *History of Loango, Kakongo, and other Kingdoms in Africa,* published in 1776. He writes:[3] "Among that prodigious mass of narratives, from which has been formed the general history of *Voyages* and *Travels,* and an infinity of others published every day, no mention is made of the languages which are spoken in the different countries, the manners and usages of which are described to us; and if the authors did not from time to time put into the mouths of the inhabitants of those distant regions, some words of which they know the meaning, we should be tempted to believe, that only dumb people had travelled among those nations . . . All will agree at least, that whatever relates to the language, its genius, *its relation to other known languages,*[4] even its mechanism and its flow are not traits which would look misplaced in the historical picture of a nation." And so Proyart proceeds to devote a chapter of his book to the Kakongo language.

In this he barely touches upon the comparative when he states: "The idiom of Kakongo, nearly the same with that of Loango, n'Golo-samba, and other small circumjacent states, differs essentially from that of Congo. *Several similar articles,*[5] *and a great number of common roots, seem, however, to indicate that these languages had a common origin;*[6] but they know not which of the two is the mother tongue. The cleverest among the Negroes have not the smallest idea of the origin and progress of their language; they speak, they say, as they have

[1] According to Ramusio's *Viaggi,* Vol. I.
[2] Translation from *A General Collection of Voyages and Discoveries made by the Portuguese and Spaniards during the 15th and 16th Centuries* (Richardson, 1789), p. 413.
[3] Chap. XII.
[4] Italics mine.
[5] i.e. prefixes.
[6] Italics mine.

heard their fathers speak. It has been thought that there might be perceived some marked connections between this language and some ancient tongues, especially the Hebrew, Greek and Latin." Despite Proyart's clear judgment through most of this chapter, he falls into that subtle temptation of trying to find connections with the ancient classical languages.[7] "There are also in the language many words pretty much resembling Hebrew words . . ." and he goes on to give a number of examples, such as **lika** (to eat) and Hebrew **lakham.** "The connections of this language with the Greek, appear equally marked . . . There are to be found also a great number of words which differ little from Greek words, and signify the same thing;" and he instances **basita** (chief) and **basileus, deko** (walk, follow) and **diôko** (I pursue), **kama** (mound, obstacle) and **kamax** (stake, prop), and so on with a number of other equally unconvincing similarities. "There are also to be found several words which seem to have come from the Latin"—and of these some certainly do, e.g. **mêsa** (table), introduced by the missionaries!

* * *

It was not; however, until the beginning of the 19th century that any categorical statement was made regarding a classification of the languages of Southern Africa. It is generally conceded that **Heinrich Lichtenstein** in 1808, in his paper entitled "Bemerkungen über die Sprachen der Südafricanischen wilden Völkerstämme," was the first to point out that "the inhabitants of Southern Africa may be divided into two principal races, viz. the Hottentots and the Kaffirs." In this paper Lichtenstein went on: "The two races may be clearly distinguished by their build, features, colour, customs and speech . . . Although the above-mentioned characteristics sufficiently illustrate the difference in origin, yet even more proof of this is the most complete lack of affinity of the two languages to one another . . . All linguistic types of the South African aborigines must be classified as dialects of either one or the other of these two principal classes." He further stated that "we are justified in considering all the inhabitants of the East Coast of Africa from 10° or 12° S. to the frontiers of the Dutch Colony, as one nation . . . to which further research may perhaps compel us to add the inhabitants of the South-west Coast." Lichtenstein also published in his *Travels in Southern Africa* not inconsiderable vocabularies of Xhosa and Tswana, and his remarks upon these showed that he conceived them to be but "dialects" of the same language.

Martin Heinrich Karl Lichtenstein, son of a Hamburg professor, was born in 1780. He studied medicine in Jena and Helmstädt taking his degree in 1802. His interests turned to the study of natural history, and he seized an opportunity which presented itself by going to Cape Town, as tutor to the eldest son of the newly-appointed Governor, General Janssens, and doctor to the family. He spent his free time studying, particularly zoology, and undertook many scientific expeditions. He joined the Dutch army as surgeon-major in the war with England, and after the English annexation of the Cape, returned to Germany and wrote up his *Travels in Southern Africa*, which appeared in two volumes, 1810-1811. Lichtenstein became professor in Zoology in 1811 at the newly-formed University of Berlin; and director of the Zoological Museum there in 1813 and the great reputation of the museum is mainly due to his untiring efforts. In 1815 he married a daughter of the manufacturer Hotho, and their house became a centre of Berlin social life, and an influence upon the musical life of the city. His only son was killed in an unfortunate duel, and Lichtenstein himself died at sea between Corför and Kiel in 1857.

* * *

Several other writers seem to have arrived at the same conclusion as Lichtenstein much about this time, but quite independently. Of these the most important was **William Marsden** (1754-1836), orientalist and antiquary. Marsden, while serving the East

[7] A temptation often succumbed to in modern days when Malay, Sumerian and other languages are similarly dragged in; see page 208 f.

India Company in Sumatra for some eight years, came into direct contact with a Bantu language through a servant of his who was a Makua from Moçambique. His contribution to the comparative study of Bantu is found in the *Narrative of an Expedition to explore the River Zaire usually called the Congo, in South Africa, in 1816, under the direction of Captain J. K. Tuckey, R.N.*, published in London in 1818. The Admiralty had requested Marsden to write to Captain Tuckey instructions which would help him on the language side of his recordings during his Congo River exploration, and in his letter is this interesting note: "I had formerly a negro servant from Mosambique, who came by the way of Bombay to Bencoolen, and having taken down from his mouth the words of his native tongue, I was afterwards much surprised to find them correspond, in many instances, not only with the language of the Caffers, as given by Sparrman, but more especially with that of Congo, as will be seen on comparing a few of the words of the latter, as given by Benjamin (the Congo black) with those taken from my servant."[8]

Marsden himself commented upon Tuckey's vocabulary as follows:

"The very copious and apparently accurate vocabulary of the *Congo* language, collected by Captain Tuckey, has furnished the means of comparison with the other languages and dialects prevailing in the southern portion of Africa, and has thereby served to establish the fact of an intimate connexion between the races of people inhabiting the western and the eastern coasts of the peninsula; although in that parallel, its breadth is little less than thirty degrees of longitude.

"Upon selecting some of the most familiar terms, and comparing them with the specimens we possess, it will be seen in the first place, that the words as written down by Captain Tuckey, from the mouths of the Natives of *Congo*, agree generally with those given by Brusciotto, Oldendorp, and Hervas; allowance being made for the differences of European orthography. They also correspond with those of the neighbouring countries of *Loango* and *Angola*, with some variety of labial pronunciation, and less perfectly with the languages of the *Mandongo* (not to be confounded with the *Mandinga* of Northern Africa) and the *Camba* people; both of the same western coast. It is highly probable, that all these mutually understand each other in conversation. Between the Congo language and that of the tribes on the eastern side, the affinity, although radical is much less striking, and the people themselves must consider them as quite distinct; but the following instances of resemblance, in words expressing the simplest ideas, may be thought sufficient to warrant the belief, that the nations by whom they are employed, must, at a remote period, have been more intimately connected." Then follows a six-column comparative vocabulary illustrating twelve English words.

Marsden's findings were summed up by the Editor of Tuckey's "Narrative" as follows: "The language of the Congo and the neighbouring states, differs very materially from all the known languages of the negroes of Northern Africa; but from the copious vocabularies obtained by Captain Tuckey, there would seem to be *a radical affinity between all the languages on the western coast of Southern Africa, and that these languages have pervaded the greater part of that portion of the Continent, and extended even to the Eastern Coast.*"[9]

William Marsden was born in 1754 at Verval, county Wicklow, and went to India at an early age. He contributed many interesting papers printed in the Philosophical Transactions, and the Archaeologia, upon subjects connected with the history and learning of Asiatic nations, and among the separate works he published are, a *History of the Island of Sumatra* (1782), a *Dictionary and Grammar of the Malayan Language* (1812), *Numismata Orientalia Illustrata*, and

[8] How early Marsden had come to these conclusions it is difficult to say, but probably before Lichtenstein published his statement; see A. Werner, "English Contributions to the Study of African Languages" in *Bibliotheca Africana*, Vol. III, July, 1929, to which I am indebted for some of these details.

[9] Italics mine.

The Travels of Marco Polo. The discovery of the unity of the Berber sub-group of Hamitic languages was due to Marsden's philological ability. In 1795 he was appointed second secretary to the Admiralty. After his retiral he succeeded Lord Stowell as senior member of the literary club founded by Dr Johnson, Edmund Burke and Sir Joshua Reynolds. He died in 1836 at the age of 81.[10]

* * *

Dr John Philip, the well-known missionary of the L.M.S. at Cape Town, unconsciously contributed his quota towards comparative Bantu studies when he wrote in the *Missionary Register*[11] for 1824: "I have been bestowing some attention on the affinity of several languages spoken in this angle of the continent of Africa; and have discovered that the languages spoken by the Cafres on the eastern coast of Africa, by the inhabitants of the Comoro Islands,[12] and by the Bootsuannas, are different dialects only of the same language. On this subject I am in possession of the most satisfactory evidence. On a comparison of the Caffre, the Bootsuanna, the Johannese, and the Pembé Vocabularies, which I have been able to collect, it strikes me as a matter of surprise that the resemblance is so remarkable; and it has been ascertained that these people speak so as to be understood by one another . . . If the Caffre Language is spoken in the Comoro Islands, it is not to be supposed that a different language is spoken on the shores of Mozambique, immediately opposite; and I have little doubt but that the different tongues spoken from the borders of our Colony to the confines of Abyssinia, and from the mouth of the Zembeza on the eastern coast of Africa to the mouth of the Congo on the western coast, will be found different dialects only of the same language."

* * *

James Cowles Prichard, M.D., in his *Researches into the Physical History of Mankind,*[13] well summed up the knowledge of African Languages and their inter-relationship in his day. He first of all paid a warm tribute to Marsden "whose opinions of any subject connected with the history of languages, and particularly of the languages of the African nations, are entitled to the greatest attention," and quoted his conclusions as recorded in Tuckey's "Narrative." He then set out comparative vocabularies, "Kosah" words culled from Lichtenstein and Boyce, "Bechúana" words from Burchell, words from Delagoa Bay from White; words of Mosambique dialects from Salt's "Makooa," from Dr Natterer and from Marsden; "Monjou" "Súhaili" from Salt, and the Kongo dialects from Tuckey and Oldendorp. Prichard adds: "A still more decisive proof of near relation is displayed between the language of the Amakosah Kafirs and the dialects of the Kongo nations, by a comparison of the personal and possessive pronouns in all these idioms[14] . . . The preceding collections exhibit specimens of languages spoken in the most distant parts of Southern Africa: they may be considered as exemplifying, though by a brief specimen, the idioms of the whole African continent to the southward of the equator, except the Hottentot dialects. The Súhaili on the eastern coast, near the River Juba, the Kongo languages in the west, and the Kafir in the south, occupy the extreme points of a great triangle. The instances of resemblance are sufficiently numerous to show undoubted proof of connexion between all these languages; but this proof of connexion is of different extent in different instances . . . When we consider the nature of these words, common to the idioms of so many distant nations, the supposition that they may have been borrowed by one people from another seems altogether untenable. We are ready to think that no other hypothesis can explain indications of affinity in the idioms of tribes in so low a degree of social culture, and spread over countries so

[10] Maunder's *Biographical Treasury.*
[11] London, 1824, pp. 144-5.
[12] He had seen Elliott's MS.
[13] I am quoting from his 3rd edition 1837, Vol. II, Chapter IV, "Researches into the Physical Ethnography of the African Races."
[14] Here follow pronominal and concord specimens from Loango, Kongo and "Kosah."

remote, except the obvious one that the tribes themselves were originally sub-divisions of the same stock." Prichard then goes on to discuss the relative closeness of relationship of the languages under consideration. Speaking of the languages of "Southern Africa," i.e. the Bantu languages, he concludes: 'We have likewise, in the instance of these last, besides the proof of near analogy in grammatical construction, which alone would bring the respective languages within the same CLASS, a further proof of relationship in the resemblance of their vocabularies. On the evidence of these facts we may, perhaps, venture to comprise them all in one FAMILY of languages."

In the Index to his 2nd edition, 1826,[15] Prichard divided the "Kaffrarian Family," of "languages allied more or less," as follows:

(*a*) Kaffers, proper.

1. Koossa Kaffers.
2. Tambucki K.
3. Dammaras.
4. Bishuanas.
5. Natives of Delagoa Bay.

} *Kaffer Language.*

(*b*) Mosambique Nations.

1. Negroes of the Mosambique Coast . . . Language allied to the Kaffer and Kongo.
2. Makooas. Macquanas.
3. Monjou.

(*c*) Kongo Race.

1. Kongoes. Angolans. Dongo People. } *Kongo Language.*
2. Loango People. Makongo. N'Goy. } *Loango Dialect of the Kongo.*

This classification, apart from the allocation of the "Dammaras," is remarkably accurate, as far as it goes.

* * *

In the same year, 1826, **Adrien Balbi**[16] set out a general table of African languages, dividing them first into five divisions: I. Nile Region, II. Atlas Region, III. Maritime Negro of Guinea and Senegambia, IV. South African Region, and V. Sudan and Interior Negro. This was obviously a geographical division, and his interesting subdivision of the "South African Region" further exemplifies this. It is as follows:

Congo Family, including Loango, Camba, Anzico or Makokko (?), Congo, Bunda or Angola, Benguela, Mandongo and Molua (?).

Caffre Family, including Southern Caffre or Caffre Proper, Western Caffre or "Beetjouane," Eastern Caffre or Mosambique (?), and Middle Caffre or Delagoa Bay.

Hottentot Family, including Hottentot and "Saab" or Bushman.

Monomotapa Family, including Monomotapa (?), Macouas, Monjoue and Sowaïel.

Galla Family, including Gallas, Muzimbos (?), Somauli, Hurrur, Gingiro (?) and Mohenemougi (?).

Here is, at any rate, a very definite attempt at a general classification, even though the "Hottentot" and "Galla" families are listed with what we now know to be Bantu languages. Balbi goes into considerable detail concerning dialects and characteristics of the various families, and after giving some general remarks upon the "Caffre Family" including record of "l'intonation qui tombe presque toujours sur l'avant-dernière syllabe," he adds "According to the researches carried out by Malte-Brun and Marsden, it seems clear that all the languages of this family, especially the Eastern or Mozambique, have a very considerable affinity with those of the Congo family; a phenomenon especially remarkable in Africa, where, with but few exceptions, the domain of each language stretches but a little distance."

* * *

The intimate connection between the Bantu languages had been recorded incidentally by travellers about this time.

[15] Page 533 of Volume I. The 1st edition had appeared as early as 1813.
[16] In his *Atlas Ethnographique du Globe ou Classification des Peuples Anciens et Modernes d'après leurs Langues.*

Campbell, in his "Travels" undertaken in 1812,[17] alluding to the Herero (Damara), remarked that their language is similar to that of the people of Moçambique. **Thompson** too, in his "Travels," undertaken in 1824,[18] stated that "it may be considered as sufficiently established, that the tribes commonly called Caffers, or Koosas (Amakosae), the Tambookies (Amatyumbae), the natives of Hambona, of Natal, of Delagoa Bay, and Mozambique, the Damaras on the west coast, beyond Namaqualand, and the numerous Bechuana tribes who occupy the interior of the Continent to an extent unexplored, are not only sprung from one common stock, but bear so striking a resemblance to each other in language, customs, and mode of life, as to be readily recognised as sub-divisions of one great family." And to them he also links the language of the Comoro Islanders.

* * *

By 1837 knowledge had so far advanced that **William Boyce,** the missionary author of the first Xhosa grammar published, was able, in his introduction to Archbell's *Grammar of the Bechuana Language,* to make a clear distinction between the "uncouth and inharmonious dialects" of the "Namacqua, Korana and Bushmen," and "the second division, or family, the South African languages" comprising "the sister dialects spoken by the Kafir and Bechuana tribes." He writes: "In the present state of our information it appears probable that all the languages of South Africa may be classed under two divisions or families. The first and most ancient, which was probably that spoken by the earliest inhabitants who found their way to this extremity of the globe, comprehend the dialects spoken by the Namacquas, Bushmen, Koranas and Hottentots; these dialects, (all of which, though differing from each other, are radically the same), were once spoken throughout all South Africa as far as the Kei River . . . These dialects are entirely different in grammatical construction from the Kafir and Sechuana language; they abound in those peculiar and barbarous sounds called clicks, and from their harshness, and the limited nature of their vocabularies, appear to be barriers in the way of religious and intellectual culture, and as such, doomed to extinction by the gradual progress of christianity and civilization . . .

"The second division, or family, of the South African languages comprises the sister dialects spoken by the Kafir and Bechuana tribes, to the east and north of the colony. That the relation subsisting between the Kafir and Sechuana is that of descent from a common parent is evident, not only from the many words common to both, but from an almost perfect identity in the leading principles of grammatical construction . . . Yet each dialect has peculiarities of its own, sufficient to oblige the learner to consider it, for all practical purposes of speech and composition, as a distinct language."[19]

Boyce, however, is wide of the mark in his observations regarding the particular importance of Tswana. He writes: "Sechuana, comprising a variety of dialects, only slightly differing from each other, appears to be a branch of an extensive language spoken through all Africa, from the northern boundary of the Cape colony, as far as the equator. On the west coast of this extensive territory the Damaras . . . speak a dialect of Sechuana. In Congo, Angola and Loango, the languages spoken are evidently of the same class. The natives of Delagoa Bay, the Makooa tribes, extending from 17° to 4° south latitude, the Sowauli or Sowaiel who dwell beyond the Makooa, as far as 2° north latitude, the Monjou, who are supposed to be so far in the interior as a two or three month's journey north-east from Mozambique, speak languages only slightly differing from the Sechuana spoken near the Cape colony." Possibly the lack of initial vowels in Tswana, a feature shared with so many other languages, as contrasted with Xhosa, caused Boyce to

[17] *Travels in South Africa,* by John Campbell, London, 1815, page 432.
[18] *Travels and Adventures in Southern Africa,* by George Thompson, London, 1827, page 187.
[19] Page xi et seq. This introduction was reproduced with very slight alteration in the 2nd edition of Boyce's own *Grammar of the Kaffir Language* 1844, see pp. viii et seq.

relegate the former to prime place as a Bantu type.

Boyce included a table of "Specimens of the Languages of South Africa resembling the Kafir and Sechuana," in which he gave examples of words from "Delagoa Bay," "Makoha" (Makua), "Monjou" (Yao) and "Sowaiel" (Swahili) in addition to Xhosa and Tswana. His comparative observations doubtless provided the foundation upon which Appleyard built. Boyce's greatest contribution to Bantu language study, however, was his discovery and naming of the alliterative concord in Xhosa.[20]

* * *

The increase in the number of published grammars of different African languages about this time made real comparative study possible. So **John Clarke,** the West African missionary, was able to write in 1848:[21]

"The following Tables may interest those who wish to compare the Languages of this part of Western Africa, with those of Bechuana and Kaffraria. There are now printed or in manuscript, grammars of the Isubu, Fernandian, Diwalla, 'Mpongwe, Banda, Kongo, Bechuana and Kaffir Tongues; and the similarity of these in the formation of the plural of Nouns, in the Possessive Pronouns, Alliteral Concord, and Conjugation of the Verb, is apparent."

Referring to the "Kaffirs," Clarke writes:[22]

"The language, with dialectic differences, is spoken by tribes from the borders of Benguela and the shores of the Atlantic, to Mozambique and Zanzibar. And the same class of language prevails from 2 deg. north latitude, behind the Galla country, to 4 deg. north latitude, at the mountains of Romby, in Biafra. Grammars in the Kaffir and Sechuana, and in the Banda, Kongo, 'Mpongwe, Diwalla, and Isubu, with examination of various other tongues, enables philologists to come to this conclusion."

* * *

And now we come to the first serious detailed study of these languages with a view to classification. We have already referred[23] to the important series of articles contributed by **John W. Appleyard** to *The South African Christian Watchman, and Missionary Magazine* in the year 1847. Here is a real commencement of serious comparative philological work on South African languages, and the substance of these articles formed the basis of Lewis Grout's admirable paper, "The Zulu and Other Dialects of Southern Africa,"[24] and were elaborated in the introduction to Appleyard's Grammar of Xhosa in 1850. These articles provide an important landmark in Comparative Bantu studies.

The first paper, "Hottentot dialects," dealt with the "Click class" of South African languages, dividing the "Hottentot family" into (1) Hottentot proper, i.e. Cape Hottentot, (2) Namaqua and (3) Korana, and drawing comparisons between the Copts of Egypt and the Hottentots. Comparative vocabularies of twenty words in each of the three types are appended.

The second, "Hottentot Grammar — Bushman dialects," provides an outline of Korana grammar taken from a manuscript written by the missionary C. F. Wuras, followed by a slight account of the Bushmen, supporting Robert Moffat's suggestion that they are really degenerate Hottentots. This contains no philological information regarding Bushman languages.

The third, "Euphonic Concord—General remarks," deals with general principles of the "Alliteral Class," the "second or principal division of South African languages" their distinguishing feature "alliteration, which is produced by the principle so appropriately termed by its discoverer, the Rev. W. B. Boyce, the Euphonic concord." Numerous examples of this are then given from Xhosa, and the importance of class distinction in nouns emphasized. Considerable space is devoted to a discussion of the probable origin

[20] Cf. "Bantu Language Pioneers of the Nineteenth Century," *Bantu Studies*, Vol. XIV, p. 218.
[21] See his *Specimens of Dailects*, p. 41.
[22] op. cit. p. 87.
[23] Cf. *Bantu Studies*, Vol. XIV, p. 223.
[24] *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 1, pp. 397-433, 1848.

of these languages and Appleyard leans to a connection with Semitic, though he states that "the position of the alliteral class is unique."

The fourth, "The Congo and Damara Dialects" deals with the first two of Appleyard's fourfold division of Bantu into (i) Congo, (ii) Damara, (iii) Sechuana and (iv) Kaffir. Congo he divides into Congo, Bunda and Benguela; and while he divides the Damara into Cattle Damara ("of the same class with the Kaffir and Sechuana," they are the Herero) and Hill Damara, he observes that the language of the latter is "the same as that of the Namaquas."

The fifth, "The Sechuana Dialects," makes a division into Eastern and Western branches. The Eastern include "the Basuto, the Batlokwa, who are better known by the name of Mantatees, the Batau, the Likhoyas," etc. The Western "one spoken by the Barolong, the Batlapi, the Baharutsi, the Bakhatla, the Bawanketsi, the Bamangwato, the Bakwena," etc., all well-known tribes of the Tswana of today. Comparative vocabularies of "Sisuto" and "Sitlapi" are given, followed by a survey of Tswana literature.

The sixth, "The Kaffir Dialects," make a threefold division into Kaffir, Zulu and Fingoe. This division is of great interest and importance. In regard to the branch, Fingoe, Appleyard states that this type was spoken by the Amafengu (now speaking Xhosa), the Amabaca (still speaking a dialect allied to Swazi), the Matabele (not Mzilikazi's tribe, but the Hlubi, remnants of the people of Pakarita, and of Facane, found then in the vicinity of the Caledon River), and the Amaswazi. Comparative vocabularies of these three types are then given, showing the "Fingoe" to be nearer to Zulu than to Xhosa, but with the strange phonetic differences found in Swazi today. A survey of the literature is then added.

The seventh, "Unclassified Dialects of the Alliteral class," touches upon the languages spoken at Delagoa Bay, Inhambane, Sofala and "Julimane," referring to Yao and Swahili, Nika and Kamba as recorded by Krapf. Useful comparative word lists follow in quite a number of languages of the East Coast.

In his grammar of 1850 where these notes are further elaborated, comparisons particularly between "Kafir" and "Sechuana" are much more developed, and tables of sound-shiftings are given at considerable length.[25] This method of treatment certainly paved the way for Bleek's fuller treatment of the subject, and the later great work of Meinhof.

Lewis Grout's paper published in 1848 need not be analysed here as it merely summarizes, though in a masterly way, the material collected by Appleyard.

* * *

It is only to be expected that a philologist of the calibre of **Ludwig Krapf** should have interested himself in the comparative side of Bantu languages and so we find, in the preface to his *Vocabulary of Six East-African Languages*, published in 1850, the following pertinent remark:[26] "It was in the Year 1844, when the Author . . . commenced his studies of the Suaheli Language on the Island of Mombas . . . he became acquainted with Natives of various and distant countries, who spoke languages—which, departing as they appeared from the Suaheli, were soon recognised to be of remarkable accord with the fundamental substance of the language of the coast, viz. the Suaheli. At that period he was not yet aware of the astonishing fact (which every new philological discovery seems to corroborate), that one common language lies at the bottom of all the idioms which are spoken from the Equator to the Cape of Good Hope."

Dealing particularly with Suaheli, he went on:[27] "It is, as it were, the introduction into the Nilo-Hamitic, or Nilotic family of languages, which must be distinguished from the Nigro-Hamitic or Nigrotic stock of languages. Almost all the tribes which reside in the South of the sources of the Bahr El-Abiad down to the Cape of Good Hope belong to the Nilotic race of Africans. Hence the Author

[25] See pp. 51-56.
[26] Page iii.
[27] Page v.

calls their languages the Nilotic family or stock of African tongues, in distinction of the languages spoken in Nigritia in the vicinity of the Niger, which belong to the Nigrotic stock. Which of the Nilotic languages can lay claim to primitiveness, the Author is as yet unable to say. Sometimes he supposed, that the Kikamba language could claim the Superiority but his opinion not being sufficiently warranted, he would rather wave this question, than proceed by guess-work. The languages of the central countries between East and West-Africa, especially around the Sources of the Bahr El-Abiad must first be brought to light, before we can settle this question."

Krapf's contribution may be closed with a quotation[28] from the preface to his *Outline of the Elements of the Kisuáheli Language*, also published in 1850: "But it is general philology, or philosophy of languages, and African philology in particular, which may feel interested in a language which is spoken within 10 or 12 degrees of Latitude on the immediate sea-coast of East Africa, and which is only a dialect of a family of languages, ramified and scattered all over South Africa."

* * *

Such was the general position of knowledge concerning these languages when the ability of **W. H. I. Bleek** (1827-1875) was brought to bear upon the problems involved. Bleek's work marked a new era in the study of South African languages.

Wilhelm Bleek was born at Berlin in 1827.[29] His father was "Privat Dozent" of theology there, but next year accepted a professorship of theology at Bonn, and here young Bleek began his studies at the classical gymnasium, finishing at Berlin, where he worked under Lepsius. First he studied theology, then philology, working on Hebrew grammar and its comparison with Arabic. At that time the first manuscript collections of African languages had been sent by the Rhenish mission to Lepsius, and Bleek was given the work of transcribing them, and preparing some vocabularies. He was struck by the great difference between the "Kafir" language and Nama Hottentot, and by the likeness of the latter in structure to Hamitic and Semitic tongues. His enthusiasm was kindled and he determined to devote himself to the study of African languages. Returning to Bonn he took his Ph.D. degree in 1851.

Bleek then went to London with a view to getting to Africa, and was appointed linguist to an expedition to the Niger, but had to turn back from Fernando Po on account of fever. On his return to London he met Bishop Colenso, who was about to start for Natal with a band of missionary workers. Colenso engaged Bleek to accompany them to do certain linguistic work.[30] At Cape Town Sir George Grey asked him to return to the Cape and undertake research work in African languages, as soon as he should be at liberty. After completing his work for the Bishop, Bleek spent a year in Zululand thoroughly studying the language and habits of the people. He then returned to Cape Town in 1856 and was appointed Interpreter to the High Commissioner. His duties included linguistic research and the collection and classification of all printed and unprinted works on African, Australian and Polynesian languages. The results of this work he published in *The Library of Sir George Grey*, Vols. I and II (1858 and 1859). After Sir George Grey's recall in 1861, Bleek was appointed, by Grey's special provision, custodian of the Grey collection presented to the Cape Town library. This office he held to his death, and it gave him unrivalled opportunities to pursue his linguistic work, bringing him into contact with missionaries in the field whom he could help and whom he induced to collect material.

Dr Bleek married in 1862 Miss Jemima Lloyd, daughter of Archdeacon Lloyd of Durban. To eke out a small salary he wrote

[28] Page 6.

[29] Details of Bleek's life were kindly supplied to me by his daughter, the late Miss Dorothea Bleek of Newlands, Cape.

[30] Bleek says "for the purpose of compiling a grammar of the Zulu Language," (*Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1855, No. 4, footnote to page 41). Bleek's *Preliminaries to a Grammar of the Zulu Language* are in MS. in the Grey Library.

leaders for the *Volkstem* until in 1869 the Queen granted him a Civil Service pension to enable him to devote more time to his linguistic work. Bleek's great work *A Comparative Grammar of South African Languages* was prepared during this period, the first part appearing in 1862 and a section of the second part in 1869. This work will need our careful consideration.

In 1870, however, Bleek had an opportunity of studying the language and folklore of a party of Bushmen who were undergoing sentence on the "breakwater" at Cape Town. As no other work was being done among the Bushmen, who were rapidly dying out, Bleek laid aside his half-finished comparative work, and in co-operation with his sister-in-law, Miss Lucy Lloyd, devoted himself to the task of saving from oblivion the most interesting people of South Africa. Before the publication,[31] however, of the valuable material he collected, Bleek died in 1875.

Much space might be given to an examination of Bleek's earlier papers, in which he set out many of the conclusions which were then crystallizing and which he set in more or less final form in his *Comparative Grammar*. His doctor's thesis, *De Nominum generibus linguarum Africae australis, Copticae, Semiticarum aliarumque sexualium*, published in 1851 before he had set foot in Africa, was devoted, apart from the comparison of Coptic and Hottentot, mainly to a detailed comparison of a number of Bantu languages from available materials. In 1855, after a visit to Western Africa, and on the eve of his departure for South Africa, Bleek read a paper "On the Languages of Western and Southern Africa,"[32] a learned disquisition dealing with the formation of the nouns and aiming at linking up many West African tongues with "the South African languages." He also contributed a number of papers to the *Cape Monthly Magazine*.

All these prepared the way for his magnum opus *A Comparative Grammar of South African Languages*, which appeared in two parts: Part I, "Phonology," in 1862, and Part II, "The Concord," Section 1, "The Noun," in 1869. A much greater work was planned, but Bleek left unfinished notes of Section 2 of Part II dealing with the Verb. His Bushman work diverted his attention from Bantu until his untimely death in 1875. Bleek's work has earned for him the title of "the Father of Bantu Philology", and it was he who first used the term *Bantu*[33] (in the form "Bâ-ntu") to designate these languages. It is interesting to trace the various suggestions for a name before this suggestion of Bleek's became the accepted form. The languages were vaguely referred to as "The South African Languages," as for instance by Balbi in 1826; Prichard had called them "the Kaffrarian Family" as early, if not before that date; Appleyard referred to them in 1847 as "the Alliteral Class," Clarke in 1848 as "the Kaffir Class, Krapf in 1850 as "the Nilotic languages"; in 1852 Barth had used the term "Ba-languages," which gave Bleek the idea for the term "Bâ-ntu" in 1862. Bleek had, however, dealt with this term as early as 1857. His MS. entitled *Zulu Legends*, prepared at that time, but not published until 1952, contains the following statement:

'The word "aBa-ntu" (men, people) means "par excellence" individuals of the Kafir race, particularly in opposition to the noun "aBe-lungu" (white men). This is still clearer from the use which is made of this word in some of the following chapters, particularly IV.2 and V.2. It appears, therefore, to be the best general term for that family of languages, of which the Kafir is known to be one of the most original and therefore, for the purposes of philology, most important members. There has not yet been suggested any really appropriate name for this great family of languages and nations, nor any other come into general use. Besides, the word "Ba-ntu" is common to almost all languages of this kindred.'

The most important of Bleek's contribu-

[31] Miss Lloyd published an attractive volume of Bushmen texts in 1911 under the title of *Specimens of Bushman Folklore*, and numerous further texts have since been published by Bleek's daughter in *Bantu Studies*.

[32] Published in the *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1855, No. 4, pp. 40-50.

[33] According to the late Dr Alice Werner, this was at the suggestion of Sir George Grey; see *Myths and Legends of the Bantu*, p. 15.

tions in his *Comparative Grammar* may be summed up as follows:

1. The classification of the language types in South Africa into (*a*) a South African division of the sex-denoting languages (Nama, !Kora, Cape Hottentot and Eastern Hottentot) and (*b*) a South African division of the Bantu family. This Bantu family Bleek classified as follows:[34]

   (i) South-eastern Branch, embracing the three main types, Kafir (with Zulu), Setshuana (with Sesuto) and Tekeza (of Delegoa Bay).

   (ii) Middle Branch, with Eastern, Interior and Western portions. The Eastern portion comprised (*a*) the Southern or Mosambique genus (including Tette, Sena, Makua and Kihiau), (*b*) the Northern or Zangian genus (including Kikamba, Kinika, Suaheli and Kisambala). The Interior portion included Bayeiye, etc. The Western portion comprised (*a*) the Southern or Bunda genus (including Otyihereró, Sindonga, Nano and Angola), and (*b*) the Northern or Kongo genus (including Kongo and Mpongwe).

   (iii) North-western Branch, including Dikele, Benga, Dualla, Isubu and Fernandian.

   This is the basis upon which present-day classification rests.

2. The arrangement of the Bantu nouns into eighteen categories, separating singular from plural.[35]

3. The careful detailed study of the Phonology of the languages, with his elaboration of the phonetic rules of palatalisation, assimilation and nasal change.

4. The extensive development of sound-shifting tables,[36] called by him "dialectal transitions of consonants."[37] Bleek used "Kafir" as the basis for the elaboration of this type of "Grimm's Law" for Bantu languages.

5. The handling of the Etymology of Bantu, in which he postulates a disyllabic verb stem with final vowel of unknown quality for which he writes -א e.g. TAND-אA.

Bleek, throughout this book compared and contrasted the Hottentot suffix formation with the prefix formation of Bantu. It is still a work of immense value to students of Comparative Bantu.

* * *

A Philologist whose work only indirectly touched upon Bantu studies was **Karl Richard Lepsius** (1810-1884), the famous German Egyptologist, who conducted the Prussian expedition to Egypt, 1842-46. Lepsius's best known works were *Denkmäler aus Ägypten und Äthiopien* ("Monuments of Egypt and Ethiopia," 1849-59) *Chronologie der Ägypter* (1848-49), *Briefe aus Ägypten* (1852), *Über den ersten ägyptischen Götterkreis* (1851).

But he was the author of *A Standard Alphabet for reducing Unwritten Languages and Foreign Graphic Systems to a Uniform Orthography in European Letters,* which appeared in 1855. This work had been prepared at the request of several Missionary Societies in London, and the proposals of Lepsius became the basis of many orthographies in Africa.[38] The alphabet was built up on the principle of a simple sign for every basic sound, and the use of diacritic marks, added to the simple sign, for certain definite modifications. Grout went "all out" for the Lepsius system in his 1859 Zulu Grammar, but received so little encouragement that it was dropped in his 1893 edition. Professor Carl Meinhof was perhaps Lepsius's most ardent and consistent follower, and the

[34] Bleek's terms for the various languages are unaltered.
[35] This classification he had already set out in 1856 in the Introduction to his *Languages of Mosambique,* though in 1851 he had made a classification into 16 categories; Hahn works upon 18 classes in his *Grammatik des Herero* (1857, Foreword written in 1854), evidently inspired by Bleek, to whom he refers.
[36] First discussed by Appleyard in 1847; and first set out by Bleek at p. 40 of *The Library of Sir George Grey,* Vol. I, 1858.
[37] See pp. 81-88 of his *Comparative Grammar.*
[38] See the full history of this in the Introduction to L. Grout's *Isizulu* 1859, pp. xxvi-lii.

impetus he gave to the system caused its adoption by most German workers on African languages.

In 1880 Professor Lepsius published at Berlin his great *Nubische Grammatik*,[39] in the introduction to which he made his contribution to Comparative Bantu studies. He divided[40] African languages into:

A. Original African Negro:

I. Bantu-Negro:
(*a*) Western:
1. Herero.
2. Mpongwe.
3. Fernando Po.
(*b*) Eastern:
4. Kafir (*a*) Xhosa (*b*) Zulu.
5. Tswana (*a*) Sotho (*b*) Rolong.
6. Swahili.

II. Mixed-Negro:
(*a*) Western: e.g. Efik, Ibo, etc.
(*b*) Middle: e.g. Ful, Kanuri, etc.
(*c*) Eastern: e.g. Dinka, Shilluk, etc.

B. Hamitic:

I. Egyptian.
II. Lybian.
III. Cushitic.
IV. Hottentot.

C. Semitic:

I. Habesh (of Abyssinia).
II. Arabic.

Lepsius followed this classification with a careful description of twelve characteristics of the Bantu family, particularly to shew the contrast with Hamitic, as follows:

1. Prefixes of Nouns according to classes.
2. Absence of Grammatical Gender.
3. Nominal Prefixes.
4. Personal (subject) Pronouns prefixed to Verbs.
5. Euphonic Alliteration.
6. Use of Prepositions instead of Postpositions.
7. Position of the Genitive after its governing Noun.
8. Position of the Subject before the Verb, and the Verb before the Object.
9. Insertion of an Object Pronoun after the Subject, and before the Verb Root.
10. Termination of Syllables in Vowels only, which may be modified by a Nasal.
11. Frequent strengthening of the Initial by a Consonantal Prefix principally by a Nasal.
12. The use of Tones.

Of these characteristics, probably today only Nos. 1, 5, 10 and 12 would be mentioned among the dozen hall-marks of Bantu languages; but they were at least a concrete attempt to set out the features.

The rest of this valuable introduction was devoted to short descriptions of the other languages in his classification, including a careful consideration of the interesting Ful language. Of great importance, too, is his consideration of Hottentot as a Hamitic tongue and his comparisons with Egyptian and Beja. The whole introduction of 126 pages entitled "Die Volker und Sprachen Afrika's" constitutes a most learned treatise.

It must not be forgotten, also, that Lepsius had had a profound influence upon Bleek, who studied under him in Berlin about 1850. Lepsius put Bleek in first touch with African languages and was probably responsible for his turning his whole attention to African philology.

* * *

In 1883 came another important contribution to Comparative Bantu studies when **Robert Needham Cust** (1821-1909) published his *Sketch of the Modern Languages of Africa* in two volumes, the second of which was devoted almost entirely to the Bantu languages.

Cust was born in Bedfordshire in 1821, being the second son of H. C. Cust, Canon of Windsor, by his wife Lady Anna Maria

[39] pp. cxxvi+506.
[40] This division is given with considerably more detail on pp. xvii and xviii.

Elizabeth, eldest daughter of Francis Needham, first earl of Kilmorey; his father was second son of the first baron Brownlow. Educated at Eton, he accepted nomination for the Indian Civil Service, and distinguished himself in Sanscrit, Persian, Arabic and Hindūstāni. At Calcutta in 1843 he completed his studies at Fort William College with great distinction, qualifying also in Bengālī. After initial work in the public service, he became personal assistant to Major Broadfoot and took part in fighting the Sikhs. When Major Broadfoot was killed at Ferozeshah, Cust temporarily carried on the Major's duties as agent to the Governor-general of the then North-west frontier. After this he was appointed in charge of a district of the newly-formed province of the Punjab. Cust lived alone among the people, and developed an intense love for them and for India.

After the annexation of the Punjab, Cust was commissioned to report on the country and its capabilities and after two years of immense labour presented his report in 1851. After certain important appointments in India, he returned to England and was there at the outbreak of the mutiny, being called to the bar in 1857. Returning to India he became Commissioner of Lahore. His first wife died in 1864, and, on the death of his second wife in 1867 Cust retired from the Indian service, nine months before completing his service for full pension.

In England he devoted himself to Oriental and religious studies, helping for a time in the preparation of the Oxford Dictionary edited by Sir James Murray. Between 1870 and 1909 he published more than sixty volumes on Oriental philology or phases of religious belief. His *Modern Languages of the East Indies* (1878) was followed by his scholarly description of the *Modern Languages of Africa* (1883), which was translated into Italian in 1885. Then appeared *Oceania* (1887), *The Caucasian Group* (1887), *The Turki Branch of the Ural-Altaic Family* (1889). *Linguistic and Oriental Essays in* seven series, were issued between 1880 and 1904. Less laborious works included, apart from translations into French, Italian and Greek, *Poems of Many Years and Places* (2 series 1887, 1897), *Clouds on the Horizon or Forms of Religious Error* (1890), *Common Features which appear in all Religions of the World* (1895), *Five Essays on Religious Conceptions* (1897), and *Life Memoir* (1899).

Cust was prominent in the proceedings of many literary societies. With the Royal Asiatic Society, which he formed in 1851, his association was especially long and active; from 1878-1899 he was honorary secretary; he was also a Vice-president, and read many papers at its meetings. He made annual tours abroad through Europe, West Africa and Western Asia, and deeply interested himself in missionary enterprise and philanthropic work, serving on the committees of the Church Missionary Society and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. He was made honorary LL.D. of Edinburgh University in 1885. Cust had attended the coronation of William IV in 1831, of Queen Victoria in 1838 and that of Edward VII in 1902. Although his eyesight failed in 1904 he pursued his studies with assistance till within a year of his death in 1909.

Apart from his direct contribution in the *Modern Languages of Africa*, Cust's influence upon Bantu studies must have been very extensive though difficult to assess. Several S.P.C.K. publications, such as Shaw's *Pocket Vocabulary of the East African Languages* (1885) and Last's *Kaguru Grammar* (1886), bear prefaces by him, and in many other ways he was in touch with missionaries and encouraged them in their literary labours. Zabala's *Diccionario Pámue-Español* was published, not only with a preface by Cust, but at his expense, as he states: "I have undertaken to publish it at my own charges, as my contribution to a subject in which I have such a deep interest." He tells how he came to turn his attention to African languages: "I was Honorary Secretary of the Royal Asiatic Society, member of the Council of the Royal Geographical Society, of the Committee of the Church Missionary Society, and of the British and Foreign Bible Society, of the Translation Committee of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and the subject of Africa, its tribes,

and Languages was always coming up. I naturally looked about for some book which would tell me generally about these Languages, and no doubt the "Universal Ethnology" of F. Müller of Vienna did tell me a great deal, but the African Chapters were scattered through a volume, devoted to the whole World and the purport of the Treatise was Ethnological rather than Linguistic."[41] And so, after publishing his *Modern Languages of the East Indies*, he turned his thoughts to Africa, and the result was *A Sketch of the Modern Languages of Africa*. This was a classified mass of information upon every language and dialect which he could trace from published and unpublished sources and from numerous scholars, missionaries and others at work in Africa. As Cust realized would be the case, much of his material can now be revised in view of present knowledge, but his book constituted a valuable cyclopaedia of reference, and a very real contribution to comparative studies.

As regards the actual classification of African Languages, Cust adopted that put out by Friedrich Müller,[42] the German philologist, who made the following division:

I. Semitic family.[43]
II. Hamitic group.
III. Nuba-Fulah group.
IV. Negro group.
V. Bántu family.
VI. Hottentot-Bushman group.

The present accepted classification is really only a modification of this, and Müller's sixfold division represents a big step forward; especially is this so when it is known that less than 50 grammars and dictionaries on all Africa were available to him.

Cust's work was a collation of knowledge and it is therefore not surprising to find that he adopts Lepsius's twelve characteristics when describing the features of Grammatical Structure peculiar to the Bantu family.[44]

Cust settled his sub-classification of the Bantu family upon the following lines:

A. Southern Branch
  I. Eastern Sub-Branch.
  II. Central Sub-Branch.
  III. Western Sub-Branch.
B. Eastern Branch
  I. Southern Sub-Branch.
  II. Eastern Sub-Branch.
  III. Western Sub-Branch.
C. Western Branch
  I. Southern Sub-Branch.
  II. Northern Sub-Branch.

This division resembles the terminology used by Bleek, and is far too much of a geographical division to prove of real value except in certain areas.

In all, Cust devotes 145 pages to the Bantu family, in which he classes 168 names, acknowledging the need for correction and amplification. His method of handling collation work of this type is entirely scientific and he fully acknowledges the work of others and the possible inaccuracies of a treatise at that stage of knowledge. "No one will sit in severer judgment on the short-comings of this work than I shall myself, and my first step after correcting my last Proof-Sheet will be to make my first entry by way of correction and addition in my interleaved copy." No true scientific worker could do more.

* * *

The first real attempt at a comparative Bantu grammar was made by the late **Father J. Torrend, S.J.,** (1861-1936) who published in 1891 his *Comparative Grammar*

---

[41] *A sketch of the Modern Languages of Africa*, pp. 1, 2.

[42] Born in Bohemia in 1834, and died at Vienna in 1898; professor of Comparative Philology and Sanscrit at the University of Vienna, having entered the Imperial Academy of Sciences in 1869. His chief works were *Précis de linguistique* (1876-1887) and *Ethnographie générale* (1873), referred to by Cust as "Outline of Philology" and "Universal Ethnology." Müller had written the "Linguistischer Theil" of the publication *Reise der Österreichischen Fregatte Novara um die Erde in den Jahren 1857, 1858, 1859*, (Vienna 1867). Of this pp. 20-50 were devoted to Bantu, his quotations being mainly from Xhosa. He treated (in Ch. I) of African Languages under three heads—Hottentot, Bantu and Hamitic. His other chapters dealt with Indian, Australian and Malayo-Polynesian Languages.

[43] The term "family" indicates derivation from a common stock, while "group" merely indicates similarity of type.

[44] See page 204.

of the South-African Bantu Languages. This is a notable landmark in Bantu Studies.

Torrend[45] was born at St Privat d'Allier in France on October 4th, 1861, and after studying from 1872-1882 in various Jesuit colleges in France, Belgium, and Ireland, came to South Africa where he engaged in teaching at St Aidan's College, Grahamstown, from 1883-1884. He soon became interested in Bantu languages, being particularly stimulated to study therein by Father Depelchin, S.J., who had recently returned from missionary explorations in the Zambesi area. Torrend says he never forgot Depelchin's admonition: "For the love of God learn the Native language. I have come across millions of men who need but to hear Our Lord's words and deeds to become so many good and happy Christians." While at Dunbrody, Cape Province, from 1884-1887 Torrend pursued studies in the sciences, philosophy and the Xhosa and Tonga languages. Of the former of these two Bantu tongues he published an outline grammar in 1887, which showed his sound grip of the structure. Tonga (of the Middle Zambesi) he studied from three youths brought down to the Colony by Depelchin, and Torrend's interests were turned towards Comparative Studies. From 1887-1889 he assisted in the commencement of the Keilands Mission in Kaffraria. In 1889 he went to St Aloysius' College, Jersey, for divinity studies, and was employed in writing his *Comparative Grammar*, which appeared in 1891. Torrend was then 30. During 1892 and 1893 he studied in Portugal, and thence proceeded as a missionary to Quelimane in Portuguese Zambesia, and undertook studies in Chwabo. In 1895 he commenced the Mission at Shupanga (where Mrs David Livingstone is buried) and laboured there till 1900, his linguistic interests being in Sena, in which language he produced some publications. During 1900 and 1901 Torrend "as a rest" (as he expresses it) taught English and German at Campolide College, Lisbon; and then from 1901-1905 continued missionary work at Boroma near Tete and at Miruru near Feira, both on the Zambesi River. His language here was Nyungwe. In 1905 he and Father Moreau founded the Chikuni Mission in Tongaland, not far from Monze, and then Torrend went on to establish the Kasisi Mission near Lusaka. Here he was stationed from 1905-1922 and his linguistic interests were in Tonga and Mukuni. After a break of six months taken in the Cape Province, Torrend spent 1922-23 studying Shona in Southern Rhodesia; he then returned to his work at Kasisi and finally at Chikuni from 1925 till his death on March 11th, 1936. It was during these latter years that he began again more intense linguistic work, publishing his *English-Vernacular Dictionary of the Bantu-Botatwe Dialects of Northern Rhodesia* and putting out readers and service books in Tonga as well as a Tonga Grammar in the vernacular and a larger one mimeographed in English.

From the above it will be gathered that Torrend had unrivalled opportunities of studying Bantu, being stationed for periods in Xhosa, Chwabo, Sena, Nyungwe, Mukuni, Tonga and Shona areas. His great comparative work was done after contacts only with Xhosa and limited Tonga speakers. From that time (1891) till the latter years of his life (1930-36) his publications were trifling: a new burst of linguistic energy emerging with his recent Tonga-Mukuni work. It is surprising that a man with such real ability and love of language should have let forty years pass without profitable output. Perhaps this can in part be explained. Father Torrend developed some strange convictions regarding Bantu. One was that the correct order of the Bantu noun classes tallied with the "days of the creation." This idea he propounded as early as 1903 in a manuscript entitled *Nouvelles études bantoues comprenant surtout des recherches sur les principes de la classification des substantifs dans les langues d'Afrique australe, avec les rapprochements curieux entre cette classification et les premiers chapitres de la Genèse, premier fascicule, Le chisendzi de Tete ou Chinyungwe*. This MS. came into the hands of D. de Gregorio, who

[45] From information supplied to me by Father Torrend in a letter of the 22nd Feb., 1935. An interesting obituary notice by P. M. Schulien, S.V.D. appeared in *Annali Lateranensi*, Vol. I, pp. 275-282, 1937.

used the material contained in it in his article "Etymologie des Soi-disant Préfixes Dérivatifs des Langues Bantoues, sur la base d'une étude spéciale sur le Chinyuŋgwe,"[46] while criticizing Torrend's main thesis.[47] This action was resented by Torrend, who wrote to me that it was "published without my authorization and without correction of proofs." He added humorously: "This was partly republished in *Anthropos*, when I was thought to have been eaten by a lion, but stopped half-way when I gave sign of life." There is no doubt that Torrend felt deeply the opposition of scholars to some of his dearest ideas: he held to this theory of noun-class order, but did not bring it prominently forward again until 1924 when he published in the *Proceedings of the Rhodesia Scientific Association* his "Bantu Classification of the Nouns from a Scientific Point of View"; while as late as 1935 he wrote to me as follows: "I now expect a miracle. This will consist of convincing you, nay even Meinhof, that I have at last got very near to the correct order and range of meaning of the Tonga classes of nouns, therefore of some Ur-Bantu." Probably this feeling kept him from entering the publication field during those forty lean years. We are, however, concerned here with what he wrote in 1891.

Torrend's *Comparative Grammar*[48] was a great work for the time when it appeared. Working on the basis of examples from some thirty "clusters," each represented by several languages or dialects, he worked laboriously through first a phonetic study and then the grammar, dealing with substantives, adjectives, pronouns and verbs, and appending certain textual specimens from Tonga and Xhosa. In his introduction, Torrend made a classification of South-African languages into (*a*) Hottentot-Bushman, (*b*) Masai, and (*c*) Bantu. This lacks proportion, Masai being but one of several intrusive Hamitic enclaves into the North-eastern Bantu area. Strange, however, is his classification of the Bantu languages themselves. On insufficient evidence and erratic similarities he connects Tswana, Makua and Mpongwe, and then classifies:

I. Main Group (all which do not belong to the above three).
II. Kua Group (i.e. Makua, etc.).
III. Fernandian (i.e. the dialects of Fernando Po, spoken by only a few thousand people).

He then gives an interesting section on the sources of Bantu literature, with valuable records of early Catholic work, and goes on to state his basis of comparison as Tonga (of the Middle Zambesi), and acknowledges many of his references as coming from Cust. Then follows a very hypothetical chapter on the origin of the Bantu.

His first chapter is devoted mainly to Phonetics, in which Torrend showed himself to be well abreast of his day, though he missed many essential distinctions which we need in comparative work today. Chapter II deals with "substantives," and Torrend recognized 18 classifiers (as Bleek), but throughout bracketed singular and plural together making in all 12 classes; this necessitated certain sub-classes in certain languages where the bracketing differed. This was a retrograde step in treatment of comparative work. A section is given on "Articles"[49] in which he considered the initial vowel of the noun prefix of certain languages as a definite article: he has not been alone in this unwarranted assumption. Throughout this chapter Torrend gave full play to his flair for etymology, and much of his work is marred and confidence in his judgment shaken by the wildest flights of imagination in connection with this. One example here will suffice: "**Mu-sana** 'the spine, the back,' lit. 'that upright member which sends its own shoots

[46] Report of the "Congrès International des Orientalistes," 4th Section, pp. 147-171; 1904. A fuller publication appeared in Gregorio's *Studi glottologici italiani*, Vol. IV, 1907, pp. 1-83.
[47] He writes: "Quoique la tentative d'établir des rapports entre les classes de substantifs bantous, comme ou les appelle, et les "jours de la création," selon la Genèse, ne piusse certainement convaincre personne, le matériel riche et sûr d'une langue bantoue, si peu connue, offert par ce travail, sera apprécié et utilisé par tous ceux qui s'occupent de linguistique africaine, et même de linguistique en général." (p. 154).
[48] pp. xlviii+336, and reference language map, 1891; with additions and corrections, pp. 4, May, 1892.
[49] §§ 317-321.

through the body.' From **sa**, notion of 'thrusting something through a body' (cf. **-yasa** 'to thrust a spear, to shoot,') and **na** or **ana**, notion of 'close union.' " Such examples could be multiplied almost indefinitely, and Torrend went near to being sidetracked from serious scientific Bantu work, as were F. W. Kolbe in his *Language Study based on Bantu,*[50] W. A. Crabtree in his *Primitive Speech,*[51] and W. Wanger in his *Scientific Zulu Grammar*[52] and especially his *Comparative Lexical Study of Sumerian and Ntu.* Fortunately Torrend was just saved from this; but his book has to be handled very critically. Along with such etymologies are to be classed such weak explanations as: One of the significances of the BU-MA class, § 456: "Things which come into being or grow to light collectively and by gentle heat, as **bu-ana buenkuku** 'chickens,' **bu-izu** 'grass,' etc." or, when explaining the "classifier MA-" in § 460 as implying "readiness to reaction," when he writes: " 'night,' which to a Kafir mind is nothing else than the universal silent renewing of nature after 'the fall of the sun.' "

Chapter III deals with the adjective: Chapter IV with the pronoun, and in this latter Torrend confuses concords and pronouns and makes a classification far from the genius of Bantu. In his treatment of the verb in Chapter V, Torrend acknowledges the complexity of the Bantu verb, but he includes a useful section (§§ 873-1018) dealing with "Auxiliaries;" here, however, he has confused auxiliary or rather deficient verbs with verbal auxiliaries. He reveals a grasp of the significance of the Copulative, even though he does speak of "the copula understood." His final treatment of derivative verbs, confined to some seven species, forms an adequate summary.

Torrend's *Comparative Grammar* was a great effort for 1891, and right down to the present day no-one has yet attempted to produce a work on a similar scale. Meinhof's work has its particular bias towards establishing Ur-Bantu. Werner's *Bantu Languages* was more in the nature of a popular outline. It is a pity that Torrend never quite got over his "etymological fever," or he might, during the 40 years, with all the added data and information accumulated during that time, have revised and rewritten a great comparative study. But there, Torrend was a conservative; he could not be shaken from his cherished ideas, and he ever retained something of the mediaeval in his grammatical attitudes.

In the *Revue Critique* in 1892, M. Victor Henry, professor at the Collège de France, criticized Torrend for taking Tonga as his basis of comparison. He did not believe any Bantu language could be considered as a standard, and regretted that Torrend had not essayed to go back to the "type préhistorique." In this he anticipated what Meinhof so successfully devoted his scholarship to a few years later.

J. van den Gheyn, S.J., devoted, also in 1892, a 29-page pamphlet, *La Langue Congolaise et les Idiomes Bantous d'après le récent ouvrage du P. Torrend, S.J.*, to a most appreciative review of Torrend's work, and says that Henry is asking for the impossible. That the distribution of the African languages was, even at this time, little appreciated is evidenced by van den Gheyn's exposing of the ill-informed statement of M. Th. Grimal de Guiraudon at the Vienna Congress of Orientalists, in 1886, when he divided African languages into two large groups — prefixal languages (i.e. Bantu) and isolated languages "familles de dialectes qui n'ont entre elles que peu ou point de parenté grammaticale, et que j'appellerai langues soudaniennes;"[53] thus entirely overlooking the position of Semitic and important Hamitic languages.

* * *

Probably the greatest figure in Comparative Bantu philology is **Carl Meinhof** (1857-1944) of Hamburg, whose two comparative

[50] 1888; but compare his earlier valuable *English-Herero Dictionary* of 1883.
[51] Part I, "A Study in African Phonetics," 1922; Part II, "The Prefix System of Bantu," 1922; in contrast to his real contribution to Ganda Grammar in 1902 and 1921.
[52] 1927: a very great work marred by absurd Sumerian derivations.
[53] *Verhandlungen des VII internationalem Orientalisten-Congresses:* Aegyptisch-Afrikanische Section, p. 68-69.

works, *Grundriss einer Lautlehre der Bantusprachen* (1899) and *Grundzüge einer vergleichenden Grammatik der Bantusprachen* (1906), marked a new scientific approach, and brought all the care of real scientific research to bear upon the subject.

Meinhof was born on 23rd July, 1857, at Barzwitz in Kreis Schlawe in Pommern, where his father was pastor. After studying in Halle, he became a gymnasium teacher for seven years, and then for seventeen years a pastor at Zizow in Pommern. Meinhof had come into contact with African Natives in his youth, some of whom had been sent to Germany from various mission fields. His interest in African languages was thus aroused. At one period a Duala man was sent to him for German tuition, but he took the opportunity of learning Duala from him. He assiduously studied the published works dealing with African languages and became an ardent disciple of Lepsius, whose "Standard Alphabet" he accepted, and advocated to the day of his death.

In 1899 he published in Leipzig the first edition of his epoch-making *Grundriss einer Lautlehre der Bantusprachen*. In this Meinhof, using for his detailed analyses the Bantu languages of Pedi (Northern Sotho), Swahili, Herero, Duala, Konde and Sango, demonstrated the laws of soundshifting between these languages, all of which, with the exception of Pedi, were in then German colonial territory. Unlike his predecessors, Appleyard, Bleek and Torrend, Meinhof did not take as his ground-form for comparison any of the living Bantu languages, be it Xhosa as Bleek or Tonga as Torrend; but, following a most detailed study of Bantu phonology, he postulated an original parent Bantu language, an Ur-Bantu, from which the modern Bantu languages have sprung. Since Bantu languages have only been reduced to writing since the advent of the White man, with the one exception of Swahili which has been written in Arabic script for a few centuries, we have not got historical evidence of soundchanges, or vocabulary or grammatical development which we can study. Meinhof was forced to work backwards, and what he has demonstrated in this book cannot, in the circumstances, be other than a hypothetical reconstruction. Other investigators may differ from him in points of detail, but it cannot be denied that his hypothetical forms provide a sound and useful basis for comparative work.

He postulates three basic vowels, **a, i, u,** with two light mixed-vowels, [54] **e, o,** and two heavy mixed-vowels, **î, û**; these latter particularly being the cause of certain drastic soundchanges. His basic consonants are as follows:

Plosives	Fricatives	Nasals	Semi-vowels
k	**ɣ**	**ñ**	—
t	**l**	**n**	**y**
p	**v**	**m**	**w**

to which he adds the derived sounds: **k̲, t̲, ɣ̲, l̲.**

So satisfactory have been these postulations that Meinhof has not found it necessary to make any alteration in this basis, though the 2nd edition of his work appeared eleven years later, and the 3rd, his English *Bantu-Phonology*, as recently as 1932.

The book opens with a chapter on Orthography in which he sets out his table of consonants according to Lepsius. Certain modifications, to meet special Bantu needs, were made in this system by Meinhof in the later editions. The orthographic principle followed was that of a basic symbol, e.g. **t**, with diacritic modifications, e.g. with subscript tilde, dot or circumflex; and this system has been followed by most German recorders of Bantu languages. The system has its advantages in that for practical purposes in an individual language the diacritic may sometimes be omitted; it has, however, been strongly held that the principle of separate symbols for different phonemes, as advocated by the International Phonetic Association, is more scientifically correct and upon this point Professor Meinhof differed strongly from t' International Institute of African Languages and Cultures, from the Executive Council

[54] i.e. vowels of secondary derivation, due to a coalescence of some type.

of which he withdrew soon after its inception.

In the next chapter he set out his thesis concerning Ur-Bantu. After this follow detailed comparative analyses of each of the six Bantu languages specially studied. In the *Bantu-Phonology*[55] of 1932, the languages chosen for this study were altered to Pedi, Zulu, Swahili, Konde and Kongo. Appended is a list of the commonest Ur-Bantu roots, each showing its modern form in the languages under consideration.

Too much importance cannot be attached to this work. The phonetic analyses in this book became the pattern, not only for much subsequent work by Meinhof, but for that of many other German researchers, numbers of whom were pupils of his. The work he did on Ur-Bantu roots was continued and expanded later by O. Dempwolff[56] and W. Bourquin[57] and provides the basis for valuable comparative root studies.

In 1902 Meinhof went to Zanzibar for research on a stipend from the Government. From 1903-1909 he taught at the Seminar in Berlin, and from 1909 onwards was on the staff of the Kolonial-institut in Hamburg. While in Berlin he was responsible for the remarkable series of "Linguistische Studien in Ostafrika" which were published in the *Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen*, Suaheli, Sambala, Namwezi and Sukuma appearing in 1904, Digo, Nika and Pokomo in 1905, Bondei, Zigula, Mbugu and Mbulunge in 1906, Dzalamo and Ndorobo in 1907, Makua and Yao in 1908.

Meinhof's work at this time was not confined to Bantu languages. In 1905 he published in the *Zeitschrift der Deutshen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* a considerable paper entitled "Hottentottische Laute und Lehnworte im Kafir," and a further work on Hottentot, his *Lehrbuch der Namasprache* appeared in 1909.

Meanwhile, in 1906, Meinhof published the companion volume to his "Lautlehre," under the title of *Grundzüge einer vergleichenden Grammatik der Bantusprachen*, a reconstruction of the grammatical forms of Ur-Bantu. Though this book has not attracted the attention accorded to his *Lautlehre*, Meinhof's *Grammatik* is a work worthy of deep study by students of Bantu. In it he deals with the basic structure of the Noun, setting out the hypothetical forms for 21 class prefixes and indicating as far as possible the significations of these classes. Meinhof had a much greater amount of first-hand material to work upon than Bleek, and he used it to good advantage in this work. He had pointed out in his *Lautlehre* (1899) that Bleek had not included the prefix **ipî** which he numbered 19; in his *Grammatik* he now added two further prefixes, viz. the augmentatives, **uɣu-** and **iɣî-**. More recent investigations have added to Meinhof's 21, two more classes: 15a, **uku-** and 20a, **aɣa-**. Meinhof's treatment of the development of the pronouns, with his deductions regarding the Ur-Bantu forms, reveals masterly handling, and a real scientific approach to the subject. He particularly deals with three considerations: (i) What common derivation have the pronouns of the various Bantu languages? (ii) What connection is there between the absolute pronouns and the "conjunctive" (i.e. verbal concords)? and (iii) What connection is there between the "personal" (i.e. absolute) and the possessives? The rest of the book is of less importance than these first two chapters. He then deals with the Numeral, the Verb (in too cursory a fashion), the "Particle" (a strange mixture of oddments including conjunctions and interjections), and gives a short section on Syntax. To this are added an appendix of examples and a full index.

Soon after Meinhof's appointment to the Seminar für Kolonialsprachen in Hamburg, he founded the well-known Journal, *Zeitschrift für Kolonialsprachen*. From its inception in 1910 Meinhof was editor, and through all the years he stimulated the production of valuable papers mainly on African languages. Contributions from his own pen have been numerous and varied. Between 1915 and 1919 he published a large amount of language material entitled

[55] Edited by N. J. van Warmelo.
[56] "Ostbantu-Wortstämme," in *Zeitschrift für Kolonialsprachen, VII.*
[57] *Neue Ur-Bantu-Wortstämme*, Berlin, 1923.

"Sprachstudien im aegyptischen Sudan;" this dealt with many languages, all non-Bantu, divided under four heads: Präfix-sprachen, Sudansprachen Nubischen Dialekte, and one Hamitensprache. The loss of the German colonies at the end of the Great War resulted in a change of title with this journal, which became the *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen.* The journal, which was suspended during the Nazi War period, has provided an outlet for the contributions of most of the best-known writers on African languages, and is a scientific paper of great value.

In 1910 Meinhof wrote a popular little introduction to African languages entitled *Die Moderne Sprachforschung in Africa,* which was translated by Miss A. Werner and published in 1915 as *An Introduction to the Study of African Languages.* During this period he produced several little language handbooks: Herero (1909), Swahili (1910) and Duala (1912).

In 1912 appeared his great study, *Die Sprachen der Hamiten,* a book of great importance to students of Hamitic languages.

In 1927, when 70 years old, Meinhof who had been presented with a *Festschrift* in honour of his years of scholarship, visited South Africa with Frau Meinhof and lectured at the Universities. Even then he could not keep from research and visited a mission where he could contact Korana Hottentots. This resulted in his publishing in 1930 *Der Koranadialekt des Hottentottischen.* He had previously published a grammatical outline and vocabulary of one of the Southern Bushman dialects.

All this intense study and linguistic output earned for Meinhof the premier place among exponents of Bantu philology and his comparative studies have secured a lasting position in the equipment of all serious students of Bantu.

* * *

A picturesque figure in Bantu language studies is that of **Sir Harry Johnston** (1858-1927), whose interest in Africa was of the keenest, his versatility taking him from military expeditions and administrative duties to all the realms of natural history and the intricate study of every African language upon which he could lay hold. In Bantu studies he will be remembered mainly for his theory of the origin and migration of the Bantu, for his computation of the date of these migrations, and for his monumental *Comparative Study of the Bantu and Semi-Bantu Languages* in two large volumes.

Harry Hamilton Johnston was born in London in 1858. His father had travelled widely and was a member of the Royal Geographical Society, while his mother came of artistic stock. From them he inherited similar interests. He was still in his teens when his first Academy picture was accepted, and at King's College he exhibited unusual linguistic talent. He first visited North Africa in 1879 and his first journalistic coup was in describing the French annexation of Tunis. It was eighteen years later that he returned there as Consul-General and he was destined to take a most prominent part in the "Scramble for Africa." In 1882 he accompanied Lord Mayo as naturalist to the interior of Angola and thence to the River Congo, as a result publishing his first book profusely illustrated by his own sketches. In 1884 he led an expedition to Mt Kilimanjaro, and by his treaties became one of the founders of Britain's East African dominions. His book on Kilimanjaro (which contained valuable linguistic material) brought him public notice, and he was persuaded to enter the consular service. After serving at Old Calabar, Cameroons and Portuguese East Africa, he began a war, first with his pen, then with his sword, against slavery in Africa. He raced the Portuguese Major Serpa Pinto for the possession of what became British Central Africa, and on the shores of Lake Nyasa he fought a long naval and military campaign against the Arab slave dealers. Johnston was knighted in recognition of his seven year's rule of British Central Africa. A great book on this province contained careful data on the ethnology, anthropology, climate, resources, and natural history of the country.

After his consular work in Tunis, Johnston became Special Commissioner and Commander-in-chief in Uganda when he did a

great administrative piece of work. Throughout all his contact with Africans he missed no opportunity to collect vocabularies and other linguistic material, and he himself considered his *Comparative Study* the greatest work of his life.

When restoring some Pygmies to their home in the Congo Forest Johnston discovered the okapi. One of the leading passions of his life was the preservation of the wonderful fauna of Africa, not only in museums, but alive in game reserves.

Later, health forced him to spend the rest of his life out of Africa. He was for long President of the African Society and was gold medallist of the Royal Geographical Society. He died in 1927.

Johnston made important contributions to our knowledge of Bantu languages in several of his larger books. One of the most important of these was in *The Kilimanjaro Expedition* (1886) in which pages 446-534 were devoted to studies of Masai and the Bantu languages of Chaga and Taveta. In this he first outlined his views on the migrations and date of movement of the Bantu. These views were later summarized in his article "Bantu Languages" written for the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1911). Here he wrote:

> "The present writer, relying on linguistic evidence, fixed the approximate date at which the Bantu left their primal home in the very heart of Africa at not much more than 2000 years ago; and the reason adduced was worth some consideration. It lay in the root common to a large proportion of the Bantu languages expressing the domestic fowl—**kuku (nkuku, ŋgoko, nsusu, ŋguku, nku).** Now the domestic fowl reached Africa first through Egypt, at the time of the Persian occupation — not before 500 to 400 B.C. . . . Yet the Bantu people must have had the domestic fowl well established among themselves before they left their original home, because throughout Bantu Africa . . . the root expressing the domestic fowl recurs to the one vocable of **kuku** . . . Among those Negro races which do not speak Bantu languages, though they may be living in the closest proximity to the Bantu, the name for fowl is quite different."

Such evidence is far too slender for so great a thesis.

Mainly judging Fula as an important link in the formation of Bantu, Johnston deduced the probable focus of Bantu development to be somewhat south of Lake Chad,[58] with a secondary focus north-west of Lake Victoria. In this map, which is rather unconvincing, he outlines boldly the probable migrations of the Bantu. Johnston was the first to use the term "Semi-Bantu" for those Bantoid languages found in West Africa. His great linguistic study was *A Comparative Study of the Bantu and Semi-Bantu Languages* in two large volumes.[59] Volume I contains a useful chapter on the "History of Research into the Bantu Languages," followed by one on the "Distribution and Characteristics of the Bantu Languages." There is a great deal of controversial and speculative matter in the latter chapter. He sums up the characteristics as: (1) vowels of Italian type; (2) agglutinative construction; (3) unchanging root frequently monosyllabic; (4) substantives divided into classes or genders indicated by prefix; (5 and 6) the principle of concord; (7) use of suffixes; (8) no sex gender; (9) numeration originally decimal; (10) use of directive 'n-' before pronouns; (11) root of the verb the singular of the imperative; (12) prepositions not postpositions used. Exception may be taken to several of these propositions, particularly to Nos. 9 and 12; and Johnston has certainly not improved on Lepsius whom he criticizes in a footnote.

After this Johnston proceeds to set out "Illustrative Vocabularies of 276 Bantu and 24 Semi-Bantu Languages and Dialects." His choice of words is very sound and useful in the main, though such a word as "ant" is too vague for Bantu languages which have as many terms as species and do not employ

[58] See his map on page xii in the 2nd Vol. of his *Comparative Study*.
[59] Vol. I, pp. xiii + 815 published by Oxford University Press in 1919, and Vol. II, pp. xii + 544 (with large folding map) published in 1922.

a generic term. The same criticism may apply to certain other words. But the main criticism of this herculean work is that the author was not discriminating in his sources or the reliability of his material, and a score of corrections could be made on almost every page of the book by people really conversant with the languages. Students have to be warned against accepting anything from these vocabularies without checking. Pages 785-815 contain most valuable bibliographical material, revealing the varied sources of the author's information, published works, manuscripts, his own researches, and the numerous returns to his vocabulary questionnaire.

The second volume is a recasting of the vocabularies comparatively dealing with each English word in all its equivalent Bantu forms. This is very useful for reference and may put many a researcher on the road to his goal; but, here again, the utmost care must be exercised in accepting any entry without checking. The late Dr Werner's appraisement[60] regarding Johnston's work was: "It is in his introductions—his phonology, and, in some cases, his views on grammatical points, that are open to question."

* * *

One who did more than any other in England towards popularizing the study of Bantu languages was **Alice Werner** (1859-1935). Her pen was facile in depicting the wonder and the regularity of the processes in this language family, thereby helping to raise in world estimation the very status of the Bantu peoples themselves. In the lecture room and more perhaps through personal contact she inspired those who came to her to learn with a keenness for study and research. With all her wealth of knowledge and experience she exhibited no trace of superiority and was always keen to benefit by any information she might elicit from her students, many of whom had seen service in the African field.

Alice Werner was born in June, 1859, and educated privately and at Newnham College, Cambridge, where she was Goldsmith's scholar from 1878 to 1880. She turned to journalism at the end of her University training, and for three years was a member of the staff of the *Review of Reviews*. In 1893 Miss Werner went to Nyasaland as teacher of the Church of Scotland Mission. There she began her study of Bantu languages, which was to be her life work, and though only a year in the country at that time, she prepared *Ntanu*, a 68-page Nyanja reading book, which was printed in 1895. After this she spent a considerable time in Natal with the Misses Colenso, daughters of the well-known Bishop, and there proceeded with the study of Zulu.

Returning to London in 1896, she started private classes in African languages and in 1901 these were transferred to King's College, London. Quite apart from the knowledge she gained in Bantu languages, Alice Werner was fluent in several modern European languages. She even lectured at one time in London University on Afrikaans.

In 1911 Alice Werner was awarded the Mary Anne Ewart Travelling Scholarship and spent two years in research work among the coastal tribes of British East Africa. Here she perfected her studies in Swahili, and did much research on other languages. In 1913 she was appointed a Fellow of Newnham College, and in 1917 became Lecturer (afterwards Reader) at the School of Oriental Studies, London. In 1921 she was appointed Professor of Swahili and Bantu, and retired in 1930.

Apart from contributing very largely to various scientific journals, especially the *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*, in which she made most valuable textual contributions upon Swahili, Alice Werner published a number of books, several of which are recognized as standard works to-day.

In 1915 she translated into English Meinhof's *Die Moderne Sprachforschung in Afrika*, and published her popular little book *The Language Families of Africa*.

In 1917 she revised and edited Steere's *Swahili Tales*, and in 1919 published her

[60] In her "English Contributions to the Study of African Languages," in *Bilbiotheca Africana* ,Vol. III, No. 2/3.

well-known *Introductory Sketch of the Bantu Languages*. In 1927 appeared *A First Swahili Book*, written in collaboration with her sister, Miss Mary Werner; and in 1930 *The Structure and Relationship of African Languages*. In 1932 and 1934 she was responsible for the production of the first two of the "Azanian Classics," *The Story of Miqdad and Mayasa* and *The Advice of Mwana Kupona upon the Wifely Duty*. At the time of her death she was engaged upon the preparation of further Swahili texts for this series.

Alice Werner's publications, however, were not confined to language works. As early as 1906 she had published in "The Native Races of the British Empire" Series the volume entitled *The Natives of British Central Africa;* and she constantly lectured on the customs and religion of East African Native Tribes. In 1925 she contributed "African Mythology" to Volume VII of *The Mythology of all Races*, and in 1933 appeared one of her most delightful contributions *Myths and Legends of the Bantu*.

Dr Werner's main contribution to Comparative linguistic studies lay in her two books, *The Language Families of Africa*, and the *Introductory Sketch of the Bantu Languages*.

The former appeared in 1915 and was reprinted in 1925 without substantial alteration. The introductory chapter summed up with a division of the African language families into:

1. The Sudanian family (isolating).
2. The Bantu family (agglutinating).
3. The Hamitic family (inflexional).
4. The Bushman group (doubtful at present).
5. The Semitic family (inflexional).

A general chapter is then devoted to the five, followed by descriptive chapters—III. The Sudanian Family, IV. The Bantu Family, V. The Hamitic Languages, VI. The Key to the Bantu Languages, VII. The Bushman Languages and VIII. The Semitic Family. In each case illustrative texts with translations follow the exposition. Nama Hottentot is included among the Hamitic languages. The "Key" to the Bantu languages treated in Chapter VI is Fula, though Miss Werner, in later life, tended to retract from this theory, which was first put forward by H. H. Johnston in his *Liberia*. This little book of 150 pages with a map proved of inestimable value to students. A condensation, dealing with the three main families, Sudanic, Bantu and Hamitic, appeared in 1930 under the title of *The Structure and Relationship of African Languages*.

The *Introductory Sketch of the Bantu Languages* is another book which has been widely used by English students of Bantu. In handy, simple form the structure of Bantu languages with much comparative detail is exposed. To a great extent the approach in grammatical classification is prejudiced by European grammatical methods but real scholarship is revealed in the discussion. Much in method is derived from the work of Meinhof, to whom the book is dedicated. The book closes with illustrative and annotated texts in Zulu, Herero, Ila, Nyanja, Swahili and Ganda, and valuable bibliographies of Bantu works.

* * *

In the realm of general phonetics applied to Bantu languages, mention should be made of three works apart from those of Meinhof and his school.

The first is Père Ch. Sacleux's *Essai de Phonétique avec son application à l'étude des Idiomes africains*, which was published in 1905. Sacleux who produced a valuable dialectical study of Swahili and earlier a notable Swahili Dictionary, was a phonetician of the Rousselot School, and the study before us reflects Rousselot's methods. General principles are set out and then various laws and phenomena applicable to Africa are given and exemplified from a great number of Bantu languages, though Swahili is the main source. Sacleux's book, however, is more academic in its usefulness than practical.

The second is Mlle L. Homburger's *Etude sur la Phonétique Historique du Bantou*, published in 1914. This book of nearly 400 pages consists almost entirely of tables comparing words in some 70 different Bantu languages, and its object is to show the

phonetic correspondences between the different languages.

The third is the *Practical Phonetics for Students of African Languages* of Professor D. Westermann and Dr Ida C. Ward, published by the International Institute of African Languages and Cultures in 1933.[61] This work is based on the phonetic principles of the International Phonetic Association, and the detail given is descriptive (not historical) in method. Although the material covers all types of African languages, there is a great deal concerning Bantu, and detailed summaries concerning Ganda, Zulu and Kikuyu are included.

* * *

Summary of the Present Position (1943):[62]

The present position of our knowledge of Comparative Bantu Philology, may be summarized tentatively as follows:

1. *Classification of the Languages of Africa:*
   - (i) *Semitic family* (Northern and Eastern Africa).
   - (ii) *Hamitic family* (Northern and North-eastern Africa, including Hottentot of South Africa).
   - (iii) *Sudanic family* (including Western, Eastern and Nilotic sections; stretching from Cape Verde in the West across the Sudan to Abyssinia).
   - (iv) *Bantu family* (Central and Southern Africa, south of the "Bantu line," a line from Cameroons, above the Congo River and Lake Victoria to the vicinity of Mombasa).

   Bushman[63] languages stand alone, though structurally akin to Sudanic. *Semi-Bantu*[64] share features of Bantu and Sudanic. *Nilo-Hamitic*[65] languages bear features of both Nilotic (Sudanic) and Hamitic.

2. *Classification of the Bantu Languages:*
   - (i) *North-western Zone:*
     - (*a*) Bube.
     - (*b*) Duala, etc.
     - (*c*) Benga.
     - (*d*) Mpongwe.
     - (*e*) Fang, etc.
     - (*f*) Kele, etc.
   - (ii) *Northern Zone:*
     - (*a*) Gishu.
     - (*b*) Konjo (or Nande).
     - (*c*) Nyoro, etc.
     - (*d*) Ganda, etc.
     - (*e*) Rundi, etc.
     - (*f*) Gikuyu.
     - (*g*) Kamba.
   - (iii) *Congo Zone:*
     - (*a*) Kongo, etc.
     - (*b*) (ki)Mbundu.
     - (*c*) North-eastern Congo (Kele, Soko).
     - (*d*) Middle Congo (Poto, Ngombe, Lolo, etc., Ngala, etc., Bangi).
     - (*e*) Teke, etc.
     - (*f*) Bira.
     - (*g*) Bua.
   - (iv) *Central Zone:*
     - (*a*) Luba-Luunda (Luba, etc., Luunda, Kanyoka).
     - (*b*) Bemba (Bemba, etc., Aushi, Lamba, etc., Bisa, Lala, Namwanga, Fipa).
     - (*c*) Tonga (Tonga, etc., Ila, etc., Mukuni, etc.).
     - (*d*) Zambesi (Subiya, Luyi, Leya).
   - (v) *Eastern Zone:*
     - (*a*) Nyamwezi, etc.
     - (*b*) Lacustrine (Kuria, Kwaya).
     - (*c*) Iramba.
     - (*d*) North-eastern (Pokomo, Taita, etc., Taveta, "Nika," etc.).
     - (*e*) Kilimanjaro (Chaga, etc., Pare, etc.).

---

[61] Second edition, 1949.

[62] The author is fully aware that since 1943, when this paper was first published, considerable advances have been made in method and approach in the analysis and classification of Bantu languages, as well as in detailed knowledge of the languages and dialects.

[63] Cf. C. M. Doke, "An Outline of the Phonetics of the Language of the Chû: Bushmen of North-West Kalahari," *Bantu Studies*, Vol. II, p. 130.

[64] Cf. H. H. Johnston, *Comparative Study of the Bantu and Semi-Bantu Languages*, Vol. II, pp. 166 et seq.

[65] Cf. A. N. Tucker, *The Eastern Sudanic Languages*, Vol. I, pp. vii-ix.

(*f*) Shambala (Shambala, etc., Zigula).
(*g*) East-central (Zaramo, etc., Sagara, etc., Gogo, Irangi).
(*h*) Rufiji (Hehe, Pogoro, Sango, Bena, Matumbi).
(*i*) Makonde, etc.
(*j*) Sutu, etc.
(*k*) Kinga.

(v,a) *North-eastern Zone:*
(*a*) Swahili, etc.
(*b*) Tikulu.
(*c*) Komoro, etc.

(v,b) *East-central Zone.*
(*a*) Nkonde or Nyakyusa (allied to Safwa and Nyixa).
(*b*) Nyasa (Tumbuka, etc., Tonga).
(*c*) Western (Nyanja, etc., Nsenga, Sena, etc.).
(*d*) Yao, etc.
(*e*) Makua, etc.

(vi) *South-eastern Zone:*
(*a*) Nguni (Zulu, etc., Xhosa, etc., Swazi, etc.).
(*b*) Sotho (Northern Sotho, etc., Southern Sotho, Tswana, etc., Kololo).
(*c*) Venda.
(*d*) Tsonga (Ronga, Tonga, etc., Tswa, etc.).
(*e*) Inhambane (Chopi, Tonga).

(vi, a) *South-central Zone:*

Shona languages, including Kalanga, Korekore, Zezuru, Karanga, Manyika, Ndau, and many other dialects.

(vii) *Western Zone:*
(*a*) (u)Mbundu.
(*b*) Eastern (Mbunda, Luchazi, Nkoya, Mbwela).
(*c*) Ambo (Ndonga, Kwanyama, Humbe, Nyaneka).
(*d*) Herero.
(*e*) Yeye.

(vii, a) *West-central Zone:*
(*a*) Lwena, etc.
(*b*) Soli.

3. *Main Characteristics of the Bantu Family of Languages:*

(i) *Morphological:*
(*a*) Inflexional, with instances of agglutination.
(*b*) Grammatical class gender in place of sex gender.
(*c*) Concordial agreement, basically alliterative, in sentence structure.
(*d*) Basic quinary system of numeration.
(*e*) High development in the conjugation of the verb, with a wealth of verbal derivative forms.
(*f*) The ideophone as a distinct part of speech.
(*g*) Non-existence of (*a*) the article, (*b*) case, and (*c*) prepositions.

That the Bantu languages constitute a language family is revealed by the underlying unity of word-roots and formative elements.

(ii) *Phonetical:*
(*a*) The word-building work of stress (which is commonly on the penultimate syllable of each word, and which demands a conjunctive method of word-division as the correct one for Bantu).[66]
(*b*) The employment of open syllables only.
(*c*) A balanced pure vowel-system with three basic vowels.
(*d*) The use of intonation both characteristic and significant.

4. *Grammatical Classification:*

The following are the Parts of Speech applicable generally to Bantu:[67]

I. Substantive
(*a*) Noun (divided into classes) (1)
(*b*) Pronoun[68]
(i) Absolute
(ii) Demonstrative
(iii) Quantitative
(iv) Qualificative
} (2)

[66] Cf. C. M. Doke, *Bantu Linguistic Terminology*, pp. 5-24.
[67] Cf. C. M. Doke, *Bantu Linguistic Terminology*, pp. 24-29.
[68] Venda has also Relative Pronouns.

II. Qualificative[69]
  (*a*) Adjective. (3)
  (*b*) Relative. (4)
  (*c*) Enumerative. (5)
  (*d*) Possessive. (6)

III. Predicative
  (*a*) Verb
    (i) Regular disyllabic
    (ii) Monosyllabic
    (iii) Vowel
    (iv) Derivative
    } (7)
  (*b*) Copulative. (8)

IV. Descriptive
  (*a*) Adverb. (9)
  (*b*) Ideophone. (10)

V. Conjunctive. (11)

VI. Interjective. (12)

[69] Swahili has also Invariable Qualificatives.

BOOK REVIEW

Slum clearance and the ability of Europeans to pay economic rent in a small South African city. JAMES IRVING. Institute of Social and Economic Research, Occasional Papers No. 3. Rhodes University, Grahamstown, 1959. 28 pp.

Professor Irving's paper contains a mass of facts, figures, tables and other data about family composition, occupational structure, gross income and net ratio per head per day (the amount that can be spent on food, clothes, etc., after rent has been deducted). All this information can be very muddling to the average interested person who, after wading through all these facts and tables, finds that under the section marked conclusions all the information is summarized in a simple form.

Professor Irving states that none of the seventy-eight families in his survey can afford to pay an economic rental of £8 per month and still have a net income of 5s. per day per head. Yet most housing officers work on the principle that a fifth of a man's income should go to rent, then on this principle those earning over £40 per month (head's income only) can afford the £8 p.m. economic rent. About half the cases have a median wage of £39. 8s. 0d. per month and it might be difficult for these families to pay £8 per month but certainly not all of them are affected.

Professor Irving goes on to say that city councils or local authorities accumulate high rent arrears and even eject tenants who appear, on paper, to be able to pay rent but do not do so. These ejectments for high arrears are not a reflection on the tenant's income or lack of it but on the housing officers employed by the city council or local authority who are not correctly applying the principles of housing management in their dealings with the tenants. The lower the income the more important it is to see that rent is paid regularly.

His conclusions that the basic factors of low wage level in small towns, lack of industrial development, etc., are correct, but the poorly educated semi-skilled worker is also to be found in the larger urban areas.

The need for subsidized housing for Europeans does still exist but to a much lesser extent than for Africans and Coloureds, but as no sub-economic funds are available at present the lower income section of all groups is suffering.

Professor Irving's paper is an interesting and detailed study of these seventy-eight families, but cannot be taken as being applicable as a whole to other similar groups. However, it can be used as a basis for the study of similar groups in other areas.

D. TUCKER
Johannesburg

AFRICAN LINGUISTIC STUDIES, 1943-1960

DESMOND T. COLE

Since the first appearance of C. M. Doke's "The Growth of Comparative Bantu Philology", *African Studies*, 2, 1, 1943, now reprinted here with minor revisions, a considerable amount of new material on the classification of Bantu and other African languages has been published, and the linguistic map of Africa today differs very considerably from that of sixteen years ago.

The Language Families of Africa

The most significant and most revolutionary contribution has been that of Joseph H. Greenberg, who has presented a completely new classification of the languages of Africa. His first move in this direction, a paper entitled "The Classification of African Languages", appeared in *American Anthropologist*, 50, 1, 1948. There followed a series of seven papers in the *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* with the general title of "Studies in African Linguistic Classification" and with sub-titles as follows:

"I. The Niger-Congo Family", *S.J.A.*, 5, 2, 1949.
"II. The Classification of Fulani", *S.J.A.*, 5, 3, 1949.
"III. The Position of Bantu", *S.J.A.*, 5, 4, 1949.
"IV. Hamito-Semitic", *S.J.A.*, 6, 1, 1950.
"V. The Eastern Sudanic Family", *S.J.A.*, 6, 2, 1950.
"VI. The Click Languages", *S.J.A.*, 6, 3, 1950.
"VII. Smaller Families; Index of Languages", *S.J.A.*, 6, 4, 1950.

Professor Greenberg rejects all previous classifications insofar as they have been based on typological or ill-defined structural criteria, that is, whether the languages in question might be categorized as inflectional or isolating or otherwise, or have gender or case systems, or manifest certain types of phonemes or phoneme-sequences, etc. His hypotheses for linguistic relationship are based essentially on comparisons of vocabulary, revealing the presence or otherwise of lexical resemblances, i.e. morphemes similar in form and meaning. Thereafter, when relationships have been established in this way, the grammatical material may be examined for further evidence, and this, in Greenberg's experience, has never contra-indicated his initial hypotheses. He emphasizes that the mere presence (or absence) of certain typological and structural features is no proof of genetic relationship. Quite unrelated languages in widely separated parts of the world have evolved, independently, similar case-systems or gender systems, etc.; quite unrelated languages may be classifiable as predominantly isolating or agglutinating or inflectional in structure, or otherwise be typologically alike. These features in themselves do not establish relationship. Languages having inflectional features, case-systems, gender-systems, etc., may, in the course of time, lose them; contrarily, languages lacking such features may evolve them. It may happen that two languages, deriving from one stock, may evolve in different directions, the one towards greater simplicity, the other towards greater complexity of morphological structure. The end-results might be typologically quite unlike, but still retain a core of common morphemes as evidence of their genetic relationship and common origin.

In comparisons of vocabulary in the search for common morphemes, two groups of words must be carefully excluded as irrelevant: "borrowings" or acquisitions of vocabulary from other languages, and chance resemblances. Foreign acquisitions or borrowings

infrequently affect the fundamental cultural vocabulary of a language, however, and they can usually be identified and eliminated fairly easily. Of chance resemblances, which can sometimes be most striking in their degree of phonological, morphological and semantic correspondence, there is always but a limited number. When morphemic correspondences between languages occur in considerable numbers therefore, and such correspondences cannot be attributed to borrowing, the languages in question must be assumed to be genetically related. The greater the number of common morphemes, the closer the relationship; the fewer resemblances, the more remote the relationship. Such resemblances in 20 percent or more of vocabulary may safely be attributed to genetic relationship; but unless similarities in phonetic structure pre-suppose a high incidence of chance correspondences, even 8 percent of common morphemes would be strongly indicative of such relationship.[1]

Employing this method of mass comparison of vocabularies, Greenberg concluded, in the series of papers cited above, that there were six major genetic families of languages in Africa and ten lesser ones, making a total of sixteen. The major linguistic families he named Niger-Congo, Central Sudanic, Eastern Sudanic, Central Saharan, Afro-Asiatic and Click. These, with their divisions into branches and lesser groups, and with the lesser families, are tabulated below:

1. Niger-Congo
   - A. West Atlantic
   - B. Mandingo
   - C. Senufo
   - D. Mossi-Grunshi
   - E. Central Togo
   - F. Kwa
   - G. West Ivory Coast Lagoon
   - H. Central Ivory Coast Lagoon
   - I. East Ivory Coast Lagoon
   - J. Ijo
   - K. Central (including Bantu)
   - L. Adamawa
   - M. Bute
   - N. Eastern
   - O. Eregba
2. Songhai
3. Central Sudanic
4. Central Saharan
5. Eastern Sudanic
   - A. Southern
     - (*a*) Nilotic
     - (*b*) Great Lakes
   - B. Nubian
   - C. Beir-Didinga
   - D. Barea
   - E. Tabi
   - F. Merarit
   - G. Dagu
6. Afro-Asiatic
   - A. Ancient Egyptian
   - B. Semitic
   - C. Berber
   - D. Cushite
   - E. Chad
7. Click
   - A. Khoisan
     - (*a*) Northern
     - (*b*) Central
     - (*c*) Southern
   - B. Sandawe
   - C. Hatsa
8. Maban
9. Mimi
10. Fur
11. Temainian
12. Kordofanian
    - A. Kawalib
    - B. Tagele
    - C. Talodi
    - D. Tumtum
    - E. Katla
13. Koman
14. Berta
15. Kunama
16. Nyangiya

In 1954 Professor Greenberg published an eighth paper, entitled "Further remarks on method: Revisions and corrections", *S.J.A.*, 10, 4, 1954, in which, as a result of further study and availability of new material, he

[1] Joseph H. Greenberg: "Historical linguistics and unwritten languages", in A. L. Kroeber: *Anthropology Today*, University of Chicago Press, 1953, pp. 265-86, at p. 270.

reduced the total number of independent families to twelve:

1. Niger-Congo
2. Songhai
3. Macrosudanic (incorporating the earlier Central Sudanic, Eastern Sudanic, Berta and Kunama)
4. Central Saharan
5. Afro-Asiatic
6. Click
7. Maban (incorporating the earlier Maban and Mimi)
8. Fur
9. Temainian
10. Kordofanian
11. Koman
12. Nyangiya

This series of eight papers was republished as a monograph in 1955, under the title *Studies in African Linguistic Classification* (The Compass Publishing Co., New Haven, Conn.). Since then Greenberg has indicated, in addresses at professional meetings, a further reduction of the number of independent families to four, although he himself has not yet published any statement to this effect. The most recent exposition of Greenberg's studies on classification appears to be that by Professor William E. Welmers, in a "Note on the classification of African Languages",[2] summarized as follows:

1. Afro-Asiatic (no change)
2. Sahara-Savannah[3] (incorporating Songhai, Macrosudanic,[4] Central Saharan, Maban, Fur, Temainian, Koman and Nyangiya)
3. Niger-Congo (as before, with the additional inclusion of Kordofanian)
4. Macro-Khoisan[5] (no change)

From the outset Greenberg's reclassification has evoked great interest and considerable controversy, although only a relatively small portion of the controversy has found its way into print. An interesting feature is that some Africanists, particularly in Europe, dismiss the whole of Greenberg's new classification as of no consequence, and are quick and outspoken in this reaction; yet these same scholars have never reacted similarly against the previously accepted classification of Meinhof, Werner, *et al.*, although they now confess disagreement with this also. It is not possible in this short survey to review the various points which have given rise to controversy on this subject. For these reference should be made to the various papers and book reviews which have appeared in various journals.[6] There can be little doubt that on points of detail, much further work remains to be done, and some of Greenberg's conclusions are likely yet to be proved wrong in the light of additional information or more detailed investigation. But it is equally clear that much of the controversy arises from fundamental disagreement in principle over the adoption of a genetic versus a typological approach to the question of classification, and from disagreement or misunderstanding about the meanings of certain terms, e.g. the definition of "linguistic family", and the objectives of linguistic classification.

For example, E. O. J. Westphal, in his paper "On Linguistic relationship", *Zaïre*, 5, May 1957, expresses the view that "The morphological criterion is generally regarded as dominant in Bantu whereas Greenberg regards the lexical criterion as dominant since he dismissed the morphological differences in the Niger-Congo family" (p. 516), and goes on to argue that Greenberg deals with "languages which belong to two entirely different *language types* (*language families*) as if they were one family" (p. 519, my italics).

For Westphal, apparently, it is language types, as determinable by morphological criteria, which constitute "families", whereas for Greenberg the term "family" is applicable only to genetically and therefore historically

[2] Supplement No. 1, *The Linguistic Reporter*, 1, 2, May 1959.
[3] The name proposed by Welmers.
[4] For which Welmers prefers "Chari-Nile", suggested by H. A. Gleason in his *Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics*, Henry Holt & Co., New York, 1955, p. 346.
[5] Proposed by Welmers, and preferred by myself, instead of Greenberg's name, "Click Family".
[6] For example, *Aequatoria, Africa, African Studies, Zaïre, Kongo-Overzee, Afrika und Übersee, Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* (B.S.O.A.S.), *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung.*

related languages, as evidenced by the existence of a convincing corpus of common fundamental morphemes. This conforms to the generally accepted significance of the term "family" in its various applications, as implying descent from a common ancestor, stock or origin. Nevertheless, Westphal charges Greenberg with "clearly using 'family' in a wider sense than it is usually given", and complains that "he owes us an explanation of his use of the term 'family'" (op. cit., p. 519)—this, despite Greenberg's introductory chapter in his *Studies in African Linguistic Classification*. If morphological criteria alone were to be taken into account we should probably be forced to exclude English from the Indo-European family of languages, since it lacks almost entirely the characteristic gender and case systems of that family!

This disagreement over definition of terminology goes further, however. While Greenberg constantly reminds us that he is concerned with genetic relationships and *not* with types or typological features of languages, Westphal repeatedly insists that Greenberg *is* dealing with language types (op. cit. pp. 517, 521, passim). It appears, however, that definitions of certain other terms are likely to come into dispute also, if they have not already done so. For example, Westphal refers to the Bantu languages as being inflectional, and to "isolating languages with which I include the 'agglutinating' languages". There can surely be very few linguists today who would subsume agglutinating languages under isolating, or who would argue that Bantu languages are anything other than essentially agglutinative in type.[7]

One suspects strongly too, that the term "morpheme" does not have the same significance for linguists in Britain as it does in the United States, whence it originates. In his paper, "Philology and Africa",[8] A. N. Tucker twice refers to the addition of "vocabularies of morphemes" to "vocabularies of words", (see pp. 549, 553), giving rise to the suspicion that for him "morpheme" is more or less synonymous with "affix", including perhaps pronouns and particles.

Another type of misunderstanding is apparent, for example, in A. N. Tucker's paper, "The Verb in Shilluk", in the final section of which he writes: "Greenberg . . . while justly stressing the strong genetic relationship between the Nilotic and Nilo-Hamitic languages, goes out of his way to label both as 'Eastern Sudanic'. There is nothing in the behaviour of the Nilotic verb to suggest any comparison with the 'Sudanic' languages west of the Nile".[9] Greenberg's use of the label "Eastern Sudanic" was purely geographical, without any implications whatsoever of relationship to languages which have been labelled "Sudanic" in any previous classification, or of relationship to his own "Central Sudanic"—on the contrary any such implications were explicitly denied by him at the time, although he later grouped his Eastern Sudanic and Central Sudanic together with others into the Macrosudanic family. Greenberg might have done well to adopt some such term as "Nilo-lacustrine" instead of Eastern Sudanic, in order to avoid possible confusion with similar terms having different established connotations; but it is obviously extremely difficult to avoid completely the use of established geographical names in new linguistic classifications. By virtue of the mere fact that such names are used in a new classification or reorganization of the material, however, the names are redefined.

Another argument which has been advanced is that even if the Bantu languages *are* related to the non-Bantu languages of Greenberg's Niger-Congo family, they should be given separate familial status, i.e. the Bantu languages should be regarded as an independent family, because of their geographic and demographic predominance over all others in Africa. Using these criteria,

[7] A. Capell dismissed any illusions on this subject in his cogent paper, "Bantu and North Australian: A Study in Agglutination", *African Studies*, 10, 2, 1951, which constituted a rejoinder to C. M. Doke's "Bantu Languages: Inflexional with a tendency towards agglutination", *African Studies*, 9, 1, 1950.

[8] *B.S.O.A.S.*, xx, 1957.

[9] *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung*, 3, 3, 1955, p. 462. See also a similar comment in his paper "Philology and Africa", p. 547.

English should be classified as an independent language family, separate from all others, since it has a wider geographic distribution, and a larger number of speakers, than any other language in the world! Geographic distribution and population statistics have no relevance whatsoever in linguistic classification.

Whatever errors Greenberg's classification may have in its present form, whatever adjustments may have to be made as more and better data become available, there can be no denying the fact that his is the first attempt at a pan-African classification on genetic principles; and that as a genetic classification it will prevail in its essentials, if not in all minute detail.

The fundamental correctness of Greenberg's position and conclusions was conceded by no less an Africanist than the late Professor Diedrich Westermann in his paper "African Linguistic Classification", *Africa*, 22, 3, 1952. Other important publications dealing with this subject, though more particularly with the "Nilo-Hamitic" area, are:

O. Köhler: *Geschichte der Erforschung der Nilotischen Sprachen.* Berlin, 1955.

G. W. B. Huntingford: "The 'Nilo-Hamitic' Languages", *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, 12, 1956.

J. Hohenberger: "Comparative Masai Word List", *Africa*, 26, 3, 1956.

J. H. Greenberg: "Nilotic, Nilo-Hamitic and Hamito-Semitic: A Reply", *Africa*, 27, 4, 1957.

J. Hohenberger: "Some notes on Nilotic, Nilo-Hamitic and Hamito-Semitic, by Joseph H. Greenberg", *Africa*, 28, 1, 1958.

A. E. Meeussen: "Hamietisch en Nilotisch", *Zaïre*, 11, 1957.

A. N. Tucker: "Philology and Africa", *B.S.O.A.S.*, 20, 1957.

J. Hohenberger: *Semitisches und hamitisches Sprachgut im Masai.* Sachsenmühle, 1958.

J. H. Greenberg: "Africa as a linguistic area", in Bascom and Herskovits: *Continuity and Change in African Cultures*, University of Chicago Press, 1959.

Area Studies on African Languages

Since 1943 a considerable amount of new work has been undertaken and published on specific linguistic areas in Africa. Outstanding among such publications are those produced by the International African Institute, London, in the series comprising the "Handbook of African Languages". Excluding the Bantu area, which is dealt with later, the following have appeared to date:

A. Basset: *La langue berbère.* 1952.

D. Westermann and M. A. Bryan: *Languages of West Africa.* 1952.

M. A. Bryan: *The Distribution of the Semitic and Cushitic Languages of Africa.* 1947.

M. A. Bryan and A. N. Tucker: *Distribution of the Nilotic and Nilo-Hamitic Languages of Africa.* 1948.

A. N. Tucker and M. A. Bryan: *The Non-Bantu Languages of North-eastern Africa*, with a supplement on "The Non-Bantu Languages of Southern Africa" by E. O. J. Westphal. 1956.

For the most part these volumes comprise lists of names of the various languages and dialects, including synonyms, in the respective areas, together with notes on geographic distribution, population statistics and the main typological features. All the volumes incorporate excellent maps and bibliographies. As compendia of such information on the languages listed, these are most valuable contributions. However, classification into larger groupings is restricted to the more obvious relationships, without any attempt at overall genetic classification.

Two other important area studies, though incorporating more detailed grammatical and lexicographical material on the languages dealt with, are:

A. N. Tucker: *The Eastern Sudanic Languages*,[10] International African Institute, London, 1940.

[10] Not to be confused with Greenberg's earlier Eastern Sudanic Family, referred to above.

A. N. Tucker and P. E. Hackett: *Le groupe linguistique Zande,* Annales du Musée Royal du Congo Belge, Tervuren, 1959.

Needless to say, much other material of this type has appeared in the form of papers in various journals, but it is not possible to review or even to list these here.

The Bantu Area

Various earlier classifications of the Bantu languages were reviewed by C. M. Doke in his "Growth of Comparative Bantu Philology", and he concluded by presenting, in outline, his own classification of the area into seven zones, with four sub-zones (totalling eleven), each with further sub-divisions into groups and languages. In 1945 this classification was presented in full in his *Bantu: Modern Grammatical, Phonetical and Lexicographical Studies since 1860.*[11] This was, however, essentially a bibliographical study, and as such it listed only those languages and dialects on which some linguistic material had been published. The classification was thus quite clearly incomplete; and since it was based very largely on incomplete or fragmentary data, it was also highly tentative. Furthermore, it was nowhere presented in totality as such, but appeared incidentally and in piecemeal fashion throughout the volume, as a general framework for the presentation of the publications reviewed therein. Recently a consolidated restatement of this classification, with minor corrections and amendments, has been presented by D. T. Cole in "Doke's Classification of Bantu Languages", *African Studies,* 18, 4, 1959.

Doke based his classification on a division into *zones,* essentially geographical areas characterized by uniform or similar linguistic phenomena, within which are *groups* of *languages* possessing common salient phonetic and grammatical features and having a high degree of mutual intelligibility. In many instances *dialect clusters,* comprising local vernaculars which contribute to or use a common literary form, are included on the same classificatory level as languages. Apart from the incompleteness of this classification, and its tentativeness owing to the inadequacy and uneven quality of the data available to him, there is probably some unevenness in Doke's application of his rather vaguely defined criteria. In a purely linguistic classification, excluding the various non-linguistic considerations which might be taken into account in practice, e.g. political divisions, orthographic diversity, independent literary development, etc., it is doubtful whether forms of speech so closely related to each other as, for example, Zulu and Xhosa, should be accorded the status of separate languages. On the other hand, Doke classified together as dialects some speech forms which, on the most superficial examination, are quite clearly distinct languages, e.g. Lovedu, which he included as a dialect of Northern Sotho, but which differs more from Northern Sotho than the latter does from Southern Sotho or Tswana.

In 1948 Dr Malcolm Guthrie published *The Classification of the Bantu Languages,* which was amplified and amended in part by his volume on *The Bantu Languages of Western Equatorial Africa* in 1953.[12] As an inventory of Bantu languages and dialects, and as a classification, these two volumes are far more ambitious than Doke's work. Nevertheless, Guthrie emphasizes the essentially tentative nature of his classification, and that it is in many respects experimental and not to be taken as authoritative in any way. It is strange, however, that Guthrie's classification should be so incomplete, and his data so inaccurate, for areas which are really well documented. One refers, here, for example, to his very incomplete listing of the South African Bantu languages and dialects, and to the numerous and peculiar errors in data quoted to exemplify features of these languages. Guthrie gathered a vast amount of his data personally, in areas and for languages which otherwise have little or no documentation. Many fascinating features emerge from these two surveys of his, but one is constantly beset by doubts as to the

[11] Percy Lund, Humphries & Co. Ltd., for International African Institute, London.
[12] Both published by the Oxford University Press for the International African Institute, London.

accuracy and reliability of the material, and therefore, of the conclusions.

In the first of his two volumes, Guthrie presents a useful discussion of the problems involved in classifying the large number of closely-related languages in the Bantu area, as well as setting out criteria for the identification of Bantu languages as such. He dismisses the geographical and historical methods of classification as being unsuitable, inconclusive and unsatisfactory for such purposes; and he devotes a good deal of space to valuable discussion and description of what he terms the "empirical" method, which in effect amounts to the application of various typological criteria. Ultimately he concludes that the "empirical" method does not provide satisfactory results, and he adopts a "practical" method for his work. This is essentially the "empirical" method but with the admission of some arbitrariness in the choice of the criteria to be used in each case, and with the provision that the classification into groups and zones is built up around the features observed in individual languages selected as starting-points — instead of attempting to begin with the whole field and trying to put in boundaries to divide it up into smaller sections.

While the establishment of genetic relationships and the classification of languages into families must be based essentially on lexical cognation (including both radical and affixal morphemes), there can be no doubt that for purposes of internal classification within such a uniform linguistic area as the Bantu, it is essential to take extensive account of typological features such as Guthrie has included in his "empirical" method. The problem here is, when faced with such a vast array of features potentially available for this purpose, which of them should be selected for consideration, and whether they should all be accorded equal status as criteria. No thoroughly objective study of this problem appears yet to have been undertaken; and the internal classification of the Bantu languages remains a long way from finality. Indeed, even were satisfactory classificatory techniques available to us right now, they could be applied only in tentative fashion because of the inadequacy of our knowledge of so many individual Bantu languages.

Another overall classification of the Bantu languages, which leans heavily on that of C. M. Doke except in the Congo and adjacent areas, is incorporated in G. van Bulck's *Manuel de linguistique bantoue*, published in 1949.[13] The most recent list and map of the Bantu area, though not a classification, appears in M. A. Bryan's *The Bantu Languages of Africa*, 1959.[14] In this work the languages are presented in "groups" or "single units", according as they show obvious close relationship to one another, but there is no classification of the groups into zones or other larger units. The organization of the groups is based largely on the classification of Professor M. Guthrie, as amended. Within each group, the languages are listed with details of dialects, geographical distribution and population statistics where available.

In addition to the works referred to above, classificatory studies and maps of specific areas in the Bantu field have appeared in various other publications. The following are a few of the more important of these:

G. Fortune: *The Bantu Languages of the Federation: A Preliminary Survey.* Rhodes-Livingstone Institute, Communication No. 14, Lusaka, 1959.

N. J. van Warmelo: *Language Map of South Africa.* Ethnological Publications No. 27, Dept. of Native Affairs, Pretoria, 1952.

C. M. Doke: *The Southern Bantu Languages.* Oxford University Press for International African Institute, London, 1954.

A. Burssens: *Inleiding tot de studie van de Kongolese Bantoetalen.* Kongo-Overzee Biblioteek, No. 8, Antwerp, 1954.

A. de Rop: *Les langues du Congo.* Editions Aequatoria, Colquilhatville, 1960.

[13] Institut Royal Colonial Belge, Brussels: Section des sciences morales et politiques, vol. 17. See esp. pp. 91 ff.
[14] Oxford University Press for International African Institute.

Much additional information on the classificatory status of individual Bantu languages and dialects, their geographic distribution and population statistics, is incorporated in the International African Institute's series, *Linguistic Survey of the Northern Bantu Borderland* and in the relevant volumes of its "Ethnographic Survey of Africa" as well as in various papers in journals and in monographs on specific Bantu languages.

Comparative and Historical Bantu Studies

A good deal of comparative material on Bantu languages, and on reconstruction of "Proto-Bantu" or "Common Bantu" forms, is incorporated in various publications listed above. The two most important "comparative grammars", though dealing with specific areas and not with the whole Bantu field, are C. M. Doke's *The Southern Bantu Languages* and A. Burssens's *Inleiding tot de studie van de Kongolese Bantoetalen*. These are essentially synchronic studies, incorporating sketches of the main grammatical features of the languages reviewed. Doke's study deals with the Nguni, Sotho, Venda, Tsonga and Shona groups of South Africa, the High Commission Territories, Portuguese East Africa and Southern Rhodesia. Burssens selected ciLuba, Swahili (Ngwana), Mongo and liNgala as the main representatives of the Congo languages for his comparative study.

In 1948 there appeared a second edition of Professor Carl Meinhof's *Grundzüge einer vergleichenden Grammatik der Bantusprachen*,[15] to the first edition of which reference has been made in C. M. Doke's "Growth of Comparative Bantu Philology", vide pp. 210 ff. This second edition, published after the author's death at the age of 87 in 1944,[16] contains a great deal of new information, all presented in the historical perspective which characterized most of Meinhof's major contributions on the Bantu languages. Among other features, two new noun classes were recognized (cl. 22, ɣa-; cl. 23, ɣi-), and important new sections included on word-formation and syntax.

A number of other writers have published contributions on the reconstruction of Proto-Bantu or Common Bantu forms, the latter term being preferred by Professor Malcolm Guthrie, who has listed some of his hypostatizations in *The Classification of the Bantu Languages, The Bantu Languages of Western Equatorial Africa*, and elsewhere.

On Ur-Bantu or Proto-Bantu some of the more important recent contributions have been made by W. Bourquin, A. Coupez, E. Dammann, A. De Rop, J. H. Greenberg, and particularly A. E. Meeussen, mainly in papers in various journals, notably *Africa, African Studies, Afrika und Übersee, Kongo-Overzee, Word* and *Zaïre*. Professor A. E. Meeussen is working on a bibliography of Proto-Bantu, and has recently (1960) produced a most valuable preliminary list, as yet unpublished, but containing over a hundred items.

The associated problem of glottochronologic or lexicostatistic dating of historical divergences of Bantu languages has as yet received relatively little attention. Two pioneer studies on this subject are A. E. Meeussen: "Lexicostatistiek van het Bantoe: Bobangi en Zulu", *Kongo-Overzee*, 22, 1956, and A. Coupez: "Application de la lexicostatistique au mongo et au rwanda", *Aequatoria*, 19, 1956.

Specific Bantu Studies and Developments in Methodology

Since 1943 a very considerable number of publications on individual Bantu languages has appeared in the form of monographs or articles in journals. Only a very few of these will be cited here, as references in connection with an outline of more recent developments in the methodology of Bantu linguistic studies. The references will be essentially to descriptive studies of Bantu languages, excluding pedagogical manuals and dictionaries.

[15] Eckardt & Messtorff, Hamburg.

[16] For some appreciations of Meinhof's contributions to Bantu linguistic studies, see "In memory of Carl Meinhof", *African Studies*, 5, 2, 1946; and D. T. Cole: *Bantu Linguistic Studies in South Africa*, Witwatersrand University Press, Johannesburg. 1957.

In South Africa most of the universities concerned with the study and teaching of Bantu languages, and from which emanate most such publications in this country, continue to use essentially what has come to be known as the Doke approach or model, though minor modifications are adopted by individual scholars and in different institutions. The following are some of the more important monographs of recent years and based on this model:

A. E. Horton: *A Grammar of Luvale.* Witwatersrand University Press, Johannesburg, 1949.

D. Ziervogel: *A Grammar of Swazi.* Witwatersrand University Press, Johannesburg, 1952.

D. T. Cole: *An Introduction to Tswana Grammar.* Longmans, Green & Co., Cape Town, 1955.

G. Fortune: *An Analytical Grammar of Shona.* Longmans, Green & Co., Cape Town, 1955.

L. W. Lanham: *A Grammar of GiTonga of Inhambane.* Witwatersrand University Press, Johannesburg, 1955.

B. I. C. van Eeden: *Zoeloe-grammatika.* Universiteituitgewers Bpk., Stellenbosch, 1956.

C. M. Doke and S. M. Mofokeng: *Textbook of Southern Sotho Grammar.* Longmans, Green & Co., Cape Town, 1957.

In the University of Natal in Durban, A. T. Cope is working on somewhat different lines, using an analysis of Zulu which represents a modification of Professor Malcolm Guthrie's approach and terminology. An outline of this analysis appears in A. T. Cope's "The Grammatical Structure of Zulu", *African Studies,* 16, 4, 1957.

In the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, and in Rhodes University, Grahamstown, considerable progress has been made in the application of American structural linguistic principles and techniques, but as yet nothing representative of this has been published. In these centres the concepts and principles of phonemic and morphemic analysis have been accepted and applied successfully, with the reservation that the mathematically prescribed requirement of absolute one hundred percent phonologically definable complementary distribution of allophones within a phoneme, as commonly insisted upon by American linguists, is not considered tenable. There is a growing body of evidence to support this view, but as yet no satisfactory statement thereof has been formulated.

One of the corner-stones of modern linguistics is the tenet that the grammatical system of a language is to be sought by reference to its own internal structure, to the exclusion of historical considerations or preconceptions based on other languages. A language is to be described as it is, not as it might have been in the past nor in terms of other structural phenomena than its own. This principle does not exclude the possibility nor the desirability of historical and comparative linguistic studies, which have their own distinctive purposes and objectives. It means simply that a synchronic linguistic analysis should not be confused with a diachronic or comparative one. Furthermore, the classification of "parts of speech" should be determined by reference to morphological and distributional features alone, excluding considerations of meaning in terms of translation equivalents in other languages, and of notional concepts of the "function" of words in synthetic environments.

It follows from this that the Doke model, in the first instance, cannot be accepted as valid for and applicable to any and all Bantu languages.[17] The extent to which it may be valid and applicable must be determined by the structure of each individual language; and we know that there are some languages in which, for example, fewer types of qualificatives occur, and others in which more types occur, than in the series of qualificative categories for which the Doke model makes provision (Adjective, Enumerative, Possessive, Relative, Invariable, to which some Bantuists add the Demonstrative and the

[17] Doke himself cautiously referred to his list of parts of speech as "applicable generally to Bantu", vide the last paragraph of his "Growth of Comparative Bantu Philology".

Quantitative, which Doke classifies as types of pronouns).

Secondly, even insofar as the Doke model may be, on the whole, valid for and applicable to a given language, it is necessary to make internal adjustments as a result of the application of purely structural criteria in the analysis. For example, the fact that locatives, even in languages such as Sotho and Nguni, can control concords, albeit to a limited extent, leads to the conclusion that they should be treated as substantives and not as adverbs. Qualificatives also are probably better subsumed under the major heading of substantives rather than constituting a category on their own. Much of Doke's terminology must be replaced by more generally accepted and precise linguistic terms; and many of his definitions, for example of "parts of speech", are couched in notional and functional terms and are therefore unsatisfactory.

None of this is to be construed as a condemnation of Doke's model or contribution to Bantu linguistic studies.[18] On the contrary, his search for a system of "Bantu grammar for Bantu languages" arose out of a realization of the need to break away from classical or traditional prescriptivism, and to find what we would now call a structural analysis based on the significant internal features of the language itself. The success of his largely unaided efforts may be gauged by the fact that his model and analyses, in their results, conform so closely to those based on modern structural principles, and that so many excellent grammatical studies of Bantu languages have been produced on essentially the same lines.

Professor Malcolm Guthrie of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, has been working for a number of years on the development of his own technique for Bantu linguistic analysis and description. The first work representing the application of his method, in its earlier developmental stage, is E. W. Price's *Ngombe Grammar* which appeared in privately published mimeographed form in 1947. Two publications at least partially representing Guthrie's method in later stages of development are G. Atkins: "The Parts of Speech in Nyanja", *The Nyasaland Journal*, 3, 1, 1950, and E. O. J. Westphal: *Kwangari: An Index of Lexical Types*, University of London, 1958. Other partial applications appear in Guthrie's own classificatory studies, *The Classification of the Bantu Languages* and *The Bantu Languages of Western Equatorial Africa*, as well as in various papers by himself and members of his school. Nowhere, however, do we appear to have a clear exposition of the principles involved. The terminology used is highly distinctive, and the analysis appears to be based essentially on form, but without the phonemic, morphemic and syntactic distributional slant of American structural linguistics.

Last, but by no means least, reference must be made to the enormous amount of work done in recent years by continental European scholars, particularly by the Belgians on the languages of the Congo. The leading figure here is Professor A. E. Meeussen of the Musée Royal de l'Afrique Centrale (formerly Musée Royal du Congo Belge), who has himself published several monographs and dozens of articles on Bantu languages during the last ten years. Prominent among the more recent grammatical studies of Professor Meeussen and his colleagues who have worked on Congo languages are the following, but there are many more besides these:

A. E. Meeussen: *Esquisse de la langue Ombo*. M.R.C.B.[19] 1952.
A. E. Meeussen: *Linguistische schets van het Bangubangu*. M.R.C.B. 1954.
A. Coupez: *Etudes sur la langue Luba*. M.R.C.B. 1954.
M. Mamet: *La langue Ntomba*, M.R.C.B. 1955.
A. Coupez: *Esquisse de la langue Holoholo*. M.R.C.B. 1955.
A. de Rop: *Grammaire du Lomongo*. Studia Universitatis Lovanium, Leopoldville, 1958.

[18] For an appreciation of Doke's work on Bantu Languages, see D. T. Cole: *Bantu Linguistic Studies in South Africa*, Witwatersrand University Press, Johannesburg, 1957.
[19] Musée Royal du Congo Belge, Tervuren.

A. E. Meeussen: *Essai de Grammaire Rundi*. M.R.C.B. 1959.
J. Vansina: *Esquisse de grammaire Bushong*. M.R.C.B. 1959.
A. E. Meeusen: *Eléments de grammaire Lega*. M.R.A.C.[20] 1960.
K. van den Eynde: *Fonologie en morfologie van het Cokwe*. Universiteit te Leuven. 1960.

Publications of the Belgian scholars have appeared mainly in the series of monographs issued by the Musée Royal de l'Afrique Centrale,[21] the Académie Royal des Sciences Coloniales[21] and the Kongo-Overzee Biblioteek, and in the journals *Kongo-Overzee, Zaïre* and *Aequatoria*. There is a good deal of variation in analytical and descriptive technique in their work, but there is no doubt that in terms of the quantity and quality of work published, the contribution of the Belgians during the last fifteen years is unrivalled.

Since 1943 advances and developments in African, and, particularly, Bantu linguistic studies have been enormous by comparison with those of any earlier equivalent period. Nevertheless, considering how vast and complex a linguistic area Africa is—perhaps, indeed, the most complex in the world—what has been achieved to date is dwarfed by what remains to be done. For only a small fraction of Africa's 800 or so distinct languages do we have reasonably satisfactory grammatical descriptions and lexicons. The need for research personnel and facilities to fill the innumerable gaps is made ever more urgent by the rapid social, economic and political developments and transitions which the African continent and its peoples are undergoing.

[20] Musée Royal de l'Afrique Centrale, Tervuren.
[21] See the *Liste des publications* issued by the Ministère du Congo Belge et du Ruanda-Urundi, 1959.

BOOK REVIEW

East African Citizen. R. E. Wraith. 1959. London, Oxford University Press. 238 pp. 9s. 6d.

There is nothing in existence resembling a text-book on African administration, a fact which makes teaching the subject difficult. It is, anyhow, a very broad subject for students to grasp because its study calls for some knowledge of anthropology, economics, law and other social sciences. Mr Wraith wrote this excellent book primarily for teachers in training who want to understand how British colonies in East Africa are run and what the toughest problems facing them really are. He has done the job wonderfully well. He obviously has a sharp eye for essentials and an honest way of expressing himself and his doubts. These will not be palatable to Africans who are under the illusion that self-government will put an end to all the troubles left by the British when they withdraw. In particular, the book includes a wise comparison between east and west Africa, which the author also knows. Mr Wraith does not deal with, or even touch on deeper issues, such as the failure of European governments to ensure that Africans get a full share of the rising national incomes that Uganda, Kenya, and Tanganyika have enjoyed in the last decade. But enough sound sense is freshly embodied in this modest book to enable one to recommend it warmly to all who have to learn or teach about the contemporary scene in Africa, and especially to those who have themselves seen little at first hand of the tropics.

J.L.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE STUDY OF CREOLE

III. Some Notes on Creole French

MARIUS VALKHOFF

When we pass in review the Creole varieties of the Western European languages, such as they once were—or still are—spread all over the world, we observe that the Portuguese ones are the most numerous and the most important. As we have seen in my second article,[1] this state of affairs need not surprise us, because the Portuguese were both the first and the best-organized colonizers. It would seem natural that their compeers and competitors, the Spaniards, should have likewise caused a large number of Creole tongues to spring up. However, this is not at all the case, and although they hispanized the greater part of Central and South America, and even played a role in Eastern Asia (e.g. in the Philippines and the Marianas), the *conquistadores* have left only three primarily creolized languages:[2] the *Malayo-Spanish* of the Philippines, the *Negro-Spanish* of Cuba and the *Papiamento* of Curaçao island in the Dutch West-Indies.[3] In the states of the American continent, we find vernaculars that one might call differently shaded *regional Spanish*, and monographs such as the one by H. L. A. van Wijk on Venezuelan Spanish can give us an idea of such a secondarily creolized language.[2, 4] I will not go here into the causes of this remarkable linguistic situation on the American continent; it is perhaps connected with the fact that the encounter between the white race and the Red Indians had been gradual, not sudden.[5]

In comparison with the Portuguese and Spanish colonial expansion, the subsequent French colonization is much less spectacular, while the exciting scramble for Africa and Eastern Asia in the last century does not concern us here. In order to understand better the linguistic situation in the Creole French speaking regions, we have to survey briefly their historical and social background. But even before we start on this outline two factors are immediately apparent. The first is the French character of the former colonies and their language, although both life and language have naturally been adapted to local conditions. We have only to compare a few sentences in Creole French with similar ones in Creole Portuguese, to notice that in the former we have to do with a *French* dialect, in the latter with a *Portuguese* one; there is no doubt about that. The second factor, which will not escape the more attentive investigator, is the profound change which has been brought about in this French by imported Negro slaves (and also Malagasy ones on the Mascarenhas). "It is quite natural to presume that the Mauritian patois was born on the lips of the [African] slave rather than of the [French] master", says one of the connoisseurs of this type of Creole.[6] It is only after deeper study and

[1] *Contributions to the Study of Creole: II. An Historic Language: Creole Portuguese*, published in *African Studies*, 19, 3, 1960.

[2] On the difference between primary and secondary Creole, see my preceding articles in *African Studies*, 19, 2 and 3, 1960.

[3] This division is given by C. Tagliavini in his excellent article *Creole, Lingue* in the *Enciclopedia Italiana*, t. XI, s.v. H. Schuchardt deals with Malayo-Spanish in "Kreolische Studien, IV: Ueber das Malaiospanische der Philippinen," in *Sitzungsberichte der K. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien*, Phil. Hist. Cl., Band CV, Heft 1, pp. 111-150.

[4] H. L. A. van Wijk: *Contribución al estudio del hablo popular de Venezuela*, Doctorate thesis of Amsterdam University, 1946.

[5] I think that D. C. Hesseling was right when he postulated as the *sine qua nons* for creolization a sudden contact between two different races and their subsequent interaction or intermingling. See i.a. his article: "Gemengde taal, mengeltaal, Kreools en Kreolisering" in *De Nieuwe Taalgids*, XXVIII (1934), pp. 310-322.

[6] Jean Urruty: "Le Patois Créole de l'Ile Maurice," in *Madagascar, Comores, Réunion, Ile Maurice*, "Les Guides Bleus," Paris, 1955, p. 85.

armed with some knowledge of the African languages that the linguist discovers the analogies between two Creole languages (e.g. French and Portuguese), due to a common substratum, and the essential divergences between each Creole variety and its corresponding "mother tongue". Unfortunately most students do not pass the first stage and treat Creole speech as continental French (or Portuguese) dialects or an aggregate of these. In the same way South African scholars ignored the phenomena of creolization presented by Afrikaans as compared with "High-Dutch".[7]

Apart from a few 16th century explorers, the main characters in the French settlement of the Antilles date back to the 17th and 18th centuries and quite a number of them were corsairs and freebooters. We have to wait for the relative stability of Louis XIII's reign and Cardinal Richelieu's determination in these and other matters to see France embark on a policy of colonization.[8] From 1635 onwards,[9] pioneers from all provinces of France—not only from the coastal ones—driven by dreams of gold and adventure, streamed to St Christophle, Martinique, Guadelupe, Dominica, Barbuda and other islands in the Lesser Antilles. Often they had to serve a three-year term as bond servants and to work hard for little gain (these were the *engagés* as distinct from the *libres*). But soon the importation of Negro slaves alleviated their lot and at the same time created favourable conditions for the birth of Creole dialects. It seems that most of these Negroes came from the coasts of Upper Guinea and must have spoken such West African languages as Ewe, Tchwi, Mandinga or others.[10] But it is well known to the historians of American colonization that the slave trade extended far beyond the Slave Coast and right into the Bantu speaking countries of Lower Guinea. This fact has been overlooked by the majority of Creole students, but it has its importance for us in South Africa, because we may look for Bantu traits even in the Creole of the Antilles. In this connection I wish to draw attention to the remarkable phenomenon that both in Portuguese Creole of St Thomas (in the Gulf of Guinea) and French Creole of Martinique the particle *ka* is used to form the progressive present tense. It is true that this auxiliary prefix could be an innovation in both cases (viz. **ca** "here" in Portuguese and *qu'a* for *qui a* in French), but how much likelier would it not seem that the form is simply a Bantu survival![11] For that matter West African and Bantu have much more in common than Indo-European and either of these African languages, and the latter are nowadays regarded as cognate groups. As for the Caribbeans, the influence of the Red Indian aborigines, since they did not work for the whites in the Antilles, was slight as compared with that of the Africans. Moreover, they soon tended to emigrate, mostly to the mainland; Martinique was almost completely abandoned by them in the 17th century. In the Greater Antilles San Domingo was settled by the French from 1665 and its eastern half, the present Republic of Haiti, has become the most

[7] "His (i.e. D. C. Hesseling's) thesis that the differences between the language of South Africa and [continental] Dutch should be substantially attributed to the influence of Malayo-Portuguese spoken by the slaves who had arrived at the Cape between 1658 and 1685, was considered by the Afrikaners as an indignity offered to their language, which in that way was degraded to a Creole idiom", J. J. Salverda de Grave: "In Memoriam D. C. Hesseling," *Neophilologus*, XXVI (1941), p. 243.

[8] E. Jourdain: *Du français aux parlers créoles*, Paris, 1956, p. IX f.

[9] This date is regarded as marking the beginning of the settlement of the Antilles and consequently the tercentenary of the event was commemorated in France in 1935.

[10] Mrs E. Jourdain, who is rightly concerned with the African substrata of her Martiniquais Creole, had informants who spoke Fon (Dahomey) and Ewe (Togo), listed in her bibliography studies on Dahomean, Mandinga and its dialects (Malinke, Bambara and Diula), Congolese and Ewe (op. cit., pp. XXIII, XXVI, XXVII) and further on in the book she also cites other languages.

[11] It is only for the Cape Verde islands that we may accept an exclusively—or almost exclusively—West African substratum, as they were peopled with slaves imported direct from the mainland opposite. In Portuguese Guinea, where the local Creole is still closely related to the Cape-Verdian one, the principal language groups are the West Atlantic (with Balanta, Manjaco, Fula, a.o.) and the Mandé group. A good *exposé* of the ethnical and linguistic position can be found in A. Teixeira da Mota, *Guiné Portuguesa*, I et II, Lisbon, 1954. In volume I, pp. 221 f., there is a chapter "Línguas," with a map.

active centre of Creole French language, literature and folklore in the world. Apart from the "Islands" (*les Iles*), as the mother country called them, French was imported into French Guiana (Cayenne), where the Portuguese influence exercised by Jewish planters and Creole speaking slaves was still great, and into Canada and Louisiana.

We see Creole French arise in those colonies where the European language was suddenly brought into contact with a quite different speech imported by the Negro slaves. Lou Lichtveldt, the talented Surinam novelist, thinks that this latter speech was originally a kind of African *koinê* born on the coasts of Guinea and brought to maturity in the Antilles. He writes: "In the New World there must have been a still greater need for them [the slaves] to make themselves understood among themselves. For that purpose they needed little or nothing of the language of their masters, of which the use was in many a case even forbidden to them (regarded as this was as an impertinence). As each of them spoke one of twenty or thirty different languages, which although related were still unintelligible to people of the other tongues, they were really compelled to find a way to understand each other well. It was this need above all that must have led to the creation of a specifically African *koinê* or *lingua franca*".[12] Unfortunately we do not possess any mention of or even any allusion to such a pan-African emergency language. There had of course been a great want of such a *lingua franca* both in the Old and the New World, but it had been supplied in quite a different manner. Surely a *koinê* did originate at the time of the slave-trade, and it was not the highest common factor of a number of West African or Bantu languages; it was the offspring of these vernaculars and Portuguese, the tongue I presented in my second article. Moreover we may assume that certain groups of slaves concurrently spoke their mother tongues at their arrival at the plantations, and this is something we should not lose sight of either. However, it is chiefly the Portuguese *lingua franca* that we hear of and especially on the coasts of the Gulf of Guinea, where most of the American slaves were drawn from. There Creole Portuguese had become most solidly rooted and Hugo Schuchardt adduced evidence of its popularity in several places up to the 1880's![13] Its part in the native vocabularies is still considerable[13] and—as we shall see below—Portuguese is also the main foreign element in local French as it is at present spoken in Senegal. Add to this that the oldest and most important slave-market in America was Portuguese speaking Brazil and that in Guiana, and even the Antilles, slaves were supplied from that country. When we keep all this information in mind, we can hardly have any doubt that Lou Lichtveldt's *koinê* was simply Creole Portuguese.

It may be worth while for us in South Africa to open a parenthesis and to examine how far the situation at the Cape was different from that in the West Indies. Here there were no plantations, but social and linguistic interpenetration could take place nearly everywhere. Sexual contact was made in the slave lodge in Cape Town and on the farms of the free burghers in the environs, about whose low morality J. L. M. Franken has published revealing data.[14] Miscegenation started right from the beginning; J. S. Marais, the historian of the "Coloureds" in South Africa, observes: "During the first 20 years of its existence no less than 75% of the children born at the Cape of slave mothers were half-breeds",[15] and this competent author also deals with a second form of miscegenation, viz. between Europeans and Hottentots. If one admits a partial

[12] "Enerlei Creools?" in *De West-Indische Gids*, XXXV (1954), pp. 59-71. The quoted passage is to be found on p. 69. On p. 66 the author gives examples of the *praesens pro imperfecto* in Creole English which can be literally translated into Afrikaans, e.g. *time he hear that, he get up: toe hy dit hoor, staan hy op*; comp. D. C. Hesseling, *Het Afrikaans*, 2nd ed., Leiden, 1923, p. 123 and esp. n.l.

[13] "Beiträge zur Kenntnis des kreolischen Romanisch. I. Allgemeineres über das Negerportugiesisch," *Zeitschr. f. rom. Phil.*, XII, p. 246. In the same article examples are given of Portuguese loan-words in African languages.

[14] *Taalhistoriese Bydraes*, Amsterdam, Kaapstad, 1953, pp. 20 f.

[15] *The Cape Coloured People, 1652-1937*, reprint, Johannesburg, 1957, p. 9.

creolization of Cape Dutch—and I do not see how an unbiased linguist can escape that admission—the concomitant conclusion seems to be that Afrikaans was born at an early date *in the bosom of the Coloured community*, of which it is still the mother tongue.[16]

We have already examined how a Creole language originated when a European tongue was adopted and transformed by a different race. Concurrent factors were that the planters and overseers themselves simplified their Portuguese or French in their relations with the slaves and that eventually the new linguistic variety was also spoken by the masters in their more companiable contacts with their concubines and coloured children. D. C. Hesseling differs from H. Schuchardt on one particular in the latter's description of the actual process of creolization (which I reproduced at the beginning of my second article), namely on the role played by the slave-owners in simplifying their language. He cannot imagine a planter or merchant indulging in suchlike linguistic acrobatics and also gives other arguments.[17] His article is thorough and would deserve a detailed analysis. Still, I myself have heard a Frenchman actually using such a kind of simplified French—after having first spoken ordinary French—in order to make himself understood by an uncomprehending native in Brazzaville. And what do *we* do in present-day South Africa when we have to put across an order to a servant who hardly understands English or Afrikaans? I for one would speak slowly and *simply*, and of course repeat my sentences. So we cannot entirely exclude a certain co-operation between planter and slave in the first period of creolization. Where favourable conditions existed —such as I have just sketched for the old Cape—Creole languages sprang up, elsewhere not, and on this point Hesseling and Schuchardt agree.

It is far too little known in South Africa that Hesseling during the whole of his long and active life maintained his "Malayo-Portuguese theory" and never admitted defeat. On the contrary, apart from his studies on the origin of Afrikaans, he built up a strong case by studying other creolized languages in new environments. I can only hint at that part of his work here, but the gist of it is also relevant to the subject I am treating at present.[18] As a professor of Modern Greek he was first interested by the analogy between the rapid evolution of Dutch in South Africa and the gradual formation of the Greek *koinê*, either as a continuation of Attic or as a mixture of dialects. Later on he dealt especially with the Tsakonian dialect, which according to him owed its most divergent and un-Greek aspect to a sudden contact of the original dialect speakers with a new people. This creolization theory applied to a Greek dialect was accepted by Hubert Pernot, another great Hellenist.[19] The Creole Dutch of the Virgin Islands was described by Hesseling as a *pendant* of Afrikaans. In one case we had a perfect type of Creole (West Indian Negro-Dutch), in the other a partially creolized language stopped on its way to becoming completely deflected and transformed (Afrikaans). At the end of Chapter V of his book he says: "I am not blind to important differences that exist between the two languages, but I trust that those who still might doubt the impact of Malayo-Portuguese on the transformation of our language in South Africa will also face their very striking simi-

[16] This idea of Dutch having been creolized in the mouth of the original Cape Coloureds had already occurred to Bernhard Struch in his "Note to the Sketch Map of African Language Families," which appears at the end of C. Meinhof's *An Introduction to the Study of African Languages*, translated from the German by A. Werner, London, 1915. On p. 168 he concluded: "Of the remaining 'Pidgin' [=Creole] languages, only Cape Dutch has become a vernacular, the greater part of the coloured population of African and Asiatic origin, in the Cape Colony, speaking it as their mother tongue". I owe this piece of information to Dr M. D. W. Jeffreys, the well-known Johannesburg anthropologist.

[17] "Hoe ontstond de eigenaardige vorm van het Kreools?" in *Neophilologus*, XVIII (1933), pp. 209-215.

[18] See J. J. Salverda de Grave, *art. cit.*, and "Derk Christian Hesseling" in *Jaarboek van de Maatschappij der Nederlandsche Letterkunde te Leiden*, 1945-46, pp. 81-87. Also: *Bibliografie der geschriften van Dr D. C. Hesseling*, Haarlem, 1939.

[19] G. H. Blanken: "Prof. Dr. D. C. Hesseling als Neograecus en Byzantinist," *Neophilologus*, XXVI, p. 253, 254.

larities".[20] There is nothing astonishing in the fact that he thoroughly learned Creole Portuguese from Schuchardt, for whom he entertained a great admiration. It is more interesting to realize why Hesseling worked on Canadian French and Ceylon Dutch. In the former we have a language which was *not* suddenly brought into contact with a native tongue and in the latter case we find ourselves in the "half-way house" between Batavia and Cape Town, where conditions must have shown analogies with those in the "frontier fortress of India" (=Cape Town). Consequently in the first case we encounter a rather archaic type of French which has slowly developed on its own, while in the second we get a variety of Dutch with marked phenomena of creolization and a linguistic picture that is more or less similar to that of the Cape. At the end of his life Hesseling was comparing Creole Spanish (Papiamento) and Negro-Dutch in order to discover reciprocal influences as well as to list the phenomena of creolization common to the two languages and to establish to what extent they are shown by Afrikaans. It was at that time (1941) that death took him away before he could place this key-stone on the work he had been building.

When we now draw the appropriate inferences from Hesseling's ideas as I have just outlined them, it is obvious that we shall not find Creole French in Canada, since no rapid or profound mixing of races took place there. We only observe a sort of *regional French* in this former colony, just as we encounter types of regional Spanish in the Southern and Central American states. In Haiti, the Lesser Antilles and French Guiana, however, tropical agriculture, especially the sugar plantations, necessitated large scale importation of black labour, and this created a fertile soil for creolization. Louisiana occupies an intermediate position and here matters are more complicated. France's famous linguist, Ferdinand Brunot, who had no reason to diminish the importance of French abroad, wrote in 1935 that this language was becoming extinct there in his time.[21] But dying dialects often linger and in 1952 President Eisenhower still judged it useful to address the French Louisianians in their own tongue when he broadcast an electoral address from New Orleans![22] It is very difficult to assess the position there from a distance and with the scarce documents at our disposal. It seems that three types of French are still spoken in Louisiana: (*a*) more or less correct French; (*b*) Canadian dialects evolved in new surroundings, and (*c*) actual Creole.[23] Among the remnants of the original population these three types are approximately represented by three social groups:

(*a*) The *white Creoles*, survivors of the first settlements. These usually speak a fair French, sometimes mixed with some peculiar words and idioms.

(*b*) The *Acadians*, descendants of the French Canadians who had been forcibly deported by the British from their abode Acadie (Nova Scotia) in 1755. They possess a rich and curious dialect (in which sub-dialects can be remarked), but it does not present the phenomena of simplification which are so characteristic of Creole languages.[24]

(*c*) The *black and coloured Creoles*. These were the slaves of the people of (*a*) and (*b*) and many of them still serve them as farm-hands and domestics. They talk what is called by the Louisianians the "dialecte créole", although at times this

[20] *Het Negerhollands der Deense Antillen, Bijdrage tot de Geschiedenis der Nederlandse taal in Amerika*, Leiden, 1905, p. 124.

[21] *Histoire de la Langue française des origines à 1900*, t. VIII., 2nd and 3rd parts, Paris, 1935, pp. 1162, 1163.

[22] M. E. Ficatier, "Les Louisianais français: Créoles et Acadiens," *Revue de Psychologie des Peuples*, 1957, pp. 3-35. This mention is to be found on p. 3. This is a good—although somewhat patriotic—historical outline and eye-witness account.

[23] Ficatier distinguishes in Louisiana French: 1. the language of the cultured "Creoles" and Acadiens, 2. Acadian proper, 3. the "dialecte créole" of the Negroes, *art. cit.*, p. 32.

[24] See H. K. Ditchie: *Les Acadiens louisianais et leur parler*, Paris, Baltimore, London, 1932. This author edited, with a short Introduction, the anonymous manuscript of a grammar and vocabulary of these interesting patois dating back to the end of the last century.

term is incorrectly applied to the tongue of group (*a*) or (*b*).[25]

This does not mean that Louisiana Creole French [sub (*c*)] has not influenced to some extent the language of the white Creoles and the Acadians. Many whites learned to speak it in their childhood from their black nurses and often white Creoles kept coloured girl-friends. "This concubinage largely explains the fact that so many Negroes in the South have a light complexion".[26]

In Africa the situation was simpler, and only "the islands in a forgotten sea"[27] have to be taken into account. It was particularly Madagascar, the marvellous subcontinent with its capable Hova population and its melodious language that attracted the French. Fort-Dauphin became their main base, to which they stuck with heroic stubbornness in spite of every possible set-back. Contacts were too rare or too hostile to permit creolization on this island. From here the Mascarenhas[28] (Reunion, Mauritius and Rodrigues) were first explored. Since the middle of the 17th century white hunters had made their appearance on the island which was named *île Bourbon*, to be changed into Réunion during the French Revolution. In 1671 it had a population of 90 inhabitants of whom 50 were white, while half a century later there lived on the island 1,550 whites against 10,950 Negroes and half-breeds.[29] These figures are approximate, but the discrepancy between the two races which they demonstrate, shows how favourable a habitat had been laid out for the birth of a Creole language. Sailing from Bourbon the French took possession in 1712 of the neighbouring Mauritius, which had been abandoned by the Dutch two years before, and changed the name to Ile de France. Before long the islands constituted a mosaic of human colour with whites, half-breeds, freedmen and slaves imported from Madagascar, Moçambique and the East. No attempts were made here to enforce an apartheid policy, as had been vainly tried in some of the Antilles,[30] so that from a sociological point of view the Mascarenhas have developed on the whole harmoniously.[31]

Half a century after the occupation of Mauritius, Mahé de la Bourdonnais decided to take possession of the Seychelles (1768), which had already been proclaimed French territory some time before; the capital still bears his name (Mahé). This extensive archipelago with its isolated island groups and often accessible coasts, soon became a favourite hiding-place for corsairs and pirates. Slaves were imported from the coast and the Mascarenhas, so that the main substrata are Bantu, Malagasy and Indian.[32] Descendants of Negro women and white settlers or corsairs abound among the leisurely inhabitants of this luxuriant scenery. In 1814 and 1815 the Seychelles and Mauritius passed under British rule, but in spite of a certain anglicization they have maintained much of their French Creole character up to our day, especially the remote Seychelles.

It may be interesting to explain here in what devious way the Creole of these islands is related to the Pidgin variety called Beach-la-Mar. One of the main articles of export of the Seychelles is the sea slug *bêche-de-mer*, for which they are noted.[33] This animal

[25] F. Brunot, *op. cit.*, p. 1163, speaks of "éléments français, appelés, on ne sait trop pourquoi, créoles".
[26] M. E. Ficatier, *art. cit.*, p. 16.
[27] This designation has been popularized by T. V. Bulpin, *Islands in a forgotten Sea*, [Cape Town, 1958.]
[28] The appellation comes from Dom Pedro de Mascarenhas, who was one of the first to visit the archipelago and gave his name to what is now Reunion island.
[29] F. Brunot, *op. cit.*, p. 1050.
[30] *ibidem*, p. 1119.
[31] Since the abolition of slavery (1835), Mauritius has had an enormous influx of Indian coolies (and Chinese ones for that matter) who have more and more constituted a serious menace to the original French-Creole character of the island. This did not happen to the same extent in Reunion, which has therefore remained both very French and very Creole. See K. Noël: *Le Problème des langues à l'Ile Maurice*. Question complémentaire pour le doctorat d'Université présentée à la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Paris, 1953.
[32] On the Creole dialect, see S. Jones: "The French Patois of the Seychelles," in *African Affairs*, LI (1952), pp. 237-247. The article is rather amateurish (the Seychellois is called a "patois without grammar or syntax"!), but the author knows some kiSwahili and another native language and hence is able to give interesting examples of Bantu influences on the Creole dialect.
[33] T. V. Bulpin, *op. cit.*, p. 172.

called *tripang* by the Malayans, is one of the delicacies of Chinese cuisine. Originally the Portuguese called it *bicho de mar*, "sea animal", which was gallicized into the queer *bêche de mer* (*bêche*=spade!) and finally corrupted into *Beach-la-Mar*. However, the latter name is now mostly used to denote the Pidgin-English spoken by East Australian and Melanesian tripang-fishermen. This dialect originated on the East coast of Australia at the end of the 18th century, and from there spread to the Pacific islands. It was also used in the sandal-wood trade and the slave-trade, which awakened to a late burst of activity there in the years 1860-80. As a language Beach-la-Mar is still much alive, presents a certain number of varieties and even tends to become the "national language" in certain groups of islands.[34]

Coming back to French Creole, we can now list the various dialects. They are:

1. *American French Creole:*
   (*a*) Cayennais;
   (*b*) Antillais;
   (*c*) Haitian;
   (*d*) Louisianais.
2. *African French Creole:*
   (*a*) Mauritian and Rodrigues-Creole;
   (*b*) Réunionais;
   (*c*) Seychellois.

Besides Creole French we also find traces of Pidgin-French, that is to say an emergency language confined to use between whites and natives. It was again H. Schuchardt who published a specimen of Indo-Chinese Pidgin-French originating from Saigon and commented upon it.[35] This jargon has of course been deeply influenced by the Annamitic substratum, that is to say it has kept the original word order and presents Annamitic words and (tone) accents. Still it shows traits, such as **nòpa** or **napa** (="il n'y en a pas") and **yana** (="il y en a") as general negative and affirmative copulae, which we also encounter elsewhere in Creole (Mauritius: **mò napa kòné**, "je ne connais pas") (all these words have final accents). As the linguistic situation in Annam has some analogy with that in Angola, where Portuguese has likewise not succeeded in supplanting the native languages (especially Mbundu), it is most likely that, now that South Annam has become an independent state, Pidgin-French has ceased to exist.

We also have evidence of the existence of *African* Pidgin-French. In a recent vocabulary of local terms and expressions used in West African French,[36] R. Mauny (University of Dakar) gives a certain number of examples of what he calls "petit nègre". Such are **y a chaud**!, it will be hot work, **gagner**, "avoir, obtenir", **mirer**, "regarder" or **trop**, "beaucoup". When this Pidgin has become popular among the natives themselves, as seems to be the case of Pidgin-English on the Gold Coast and a few other places in Africa, we have a right to speak of Creole (or Semi-Creole). Such an extension of its use has also taken place in French territories, for Mauny defines *petit nègre* as follows: "Simplified tongue used to address those Negroes who only know the rudiments of French, or, *between illiterate Negroes of different languages who resort to French to understand each other*" (s.v.; italics mine); so that it is now both Pidgin and Creole. This booklet which also contains historical terms, is interesting in several respects: it gives a comprehensive picture of social life and popular beliefs in that part of Africa and thanks to its etymologies it informs us about the influences French underwent there. It is natural that Portuguese still comes first among these, as the language of the original explorers and colonizers of these regions. Terms such as **argamasse** "terrace of a house" (*argamassa*), the fruit **avocat** "avocado", **basses** "shoal, shallow" (*baixos*), or **signare** "coloured woman living with a European as his

[34] See *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, s.v. "Pidgin English," v. XVII, 914B and *Winkler Prins Encyclopaedie*, s.v. "Beach-la-Mar," v. III, 408a. More recent studies are to be found in the *Linguistic Bibliography* published under the auspices of Unesco.

[35] "Kreolische Studien. VIII. Ueber das Annamito-französische," *Sitzungsber. der K. Akad. der Wissenschaften zu Wien*, CXVI (1888), 7, pp. 227-234.

[36] *Glossaire des expressions et termes employés dans l'Ouest Africain*, Institut Français d'Afrique Noire, Ifan-Dakar, 1952.

wife" (*senhora*), abound; **langue franque** itself figures in this list as an historical term for Creole Portuguese in West Africa. With its nearly 700 words Mauny is a suitable pendant of Hobson-Jobson, which is equally revealing for the Portuguese element in Indian English.[37]

I would equate Schuchardt's specimen of Indo-Chinese Pidgin-French with *Semi-Creole*. It does not look like an entirely new language, different from French (primary Creole), nor can it be considered as only slightly "corrupted" French (secondary Creole). Probably the same applies to the "petit nègre" in West Africa, although we are not able to judge of it for lack of examples of complete sentences. I found a good instance of present-day Mauritian Semi-Creole in a small catechism.[38] It offers indeed a language which is a fair cross between literary French and pure Creole. But when it is printed every Creole variety has a tendency to become Semi-Creole, as we have already seen in the case of Creole Portuguese (in my second article); wherever a "correctly" speaking intelligentsia uses it for their own amusement or other people's edification, Creole tends to become lusitanized or gallicized.[39]

In an article written in 1933 the Hungarian Romanicist L. Gáldi (or Göbl) complained that the study of Creole French was still handicapped by the lack of oral and recent material and by the amateurism of most writers, whereas the other Creole languages had found serious scholars to describe them: Schuchardt and Lenz for Creole Spanish, Coelho, Schuchardt and Dalgado for Creole Portuguese, Hesseling and Josselin de Jong for Creole Dutch.[40] In our day, more than a quarter of a century afterwards, the situation has slightly improved, but one still feels in studies on this topic the *mépris* of the cultured white Creole, who by far prefers his literary French to this *langage bâtard*. He may also exhibit a regrettable tendency to whitewash the French patois by ignoring or denying its African descent.[41] This is of course an un-scientific attitude, because in science every object of investigation ought to be approached with an open mind. The botanist who studies certain types of moulds will not complain of their alleged ugliness and will not prefer flowers to them, nor will the pathologist declare that he is disgusted by some new disease which he is observing. Moreover, as I hope to prove in the latter half of this article, the Creole varieties do not at all deserve this contempt and can boast of fine qualities of picturesqueness as well as resourcefulness. However, besides obsolete and dilettantish work, we now have at our disposal a few good books on French Creole such as Robert A. Hall's outstanding structural study of Haitian

---

[37] H. Yule and A. C. Burnell: *Hobson-Jobson: Glossary of colloquial Anglo-Indian words and phrases and of kindred terms, etymological, historical, geographical and discursive.* New ed. edited by W. Crooke. London, 1903. This book is also quoted by H. Schuchardt, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis des kreolischen Romanisch.* V. *Allgemeines über das Indoportugiesische (Asio-portugiesische)*, p.483, who makes good use of it in the same article.

[38] *Petit catéchisme en patois créole*, Maurice, The General Printing and Stationary Limited, 1952. I owe this booklet to the kindness of Mr D. Banmeyer, president of the Johannesburg Alliance Française. Here is a short specimen (p. 6). Q.: *Combien éna commandements bon Dieu?*

R. *Dix commandements bon Dieu.*

1. *Faudrait adore bon Dieu tout seul, n'a pas ocupe gris-gris sorcier, petit Albert, dire la prière bon matin et à soir, n'a pas capave alle dans cérémonie païens.*
2. *N'a pas jure nom bon Dieu, n'a pas faire serment bonavini, quand prends nous témoin: faudrait toujours dire la vérité.*

Etc.

[39] This is also the impression made by a Creole dialogue in a recent issue of *L'Epée* (27th April, 1960), which Dr K. Noel, Education Officer on Mauritius, was so kind as to send me.

[40] "Problemi di sostrato nel creolo-francese", *Revue de Linguistique Romane*, IX (1933), pp. 336 f.

[41] The whole purpose of J. Fayne's book with the pretentious title of *Le Créole dans l'univers*, v. I (II has never appeared so far as I know), Port-au-Prince (Haiti), 1939, was to demonstrate this "racial purity" of his Creole. "Ainsi je parvins a reconstituer les éléments qui sont à la base de notre idiome. Du même coup, et contrairement à l'opinion généralement admise, la prétendue influence des langues dites de couleur, notamment celles de l'Afrique Occidentale, sur la contexture du créole, s'est trouvée réduite au néant" (p. XIX)(!)

French[42] and two doctoral theses, one by Suzanne Comhaire-Sylvain on Haitian[43] and one by Elodie Jourdain on Martiniquais Creole.[44]

Mrs Jourdain and B. Lopes da Silva have in common that they are Creoles themselves and hence well acquainted with the dialects they are describing. However, they also share the failing of being haunted by the languages from which their Martiniquais or Capeverdian were derived and in this way they are unable to judge their "Creoles" objectively. Mrs Jourdain even goes so far as to maintain the ambiguous and defective official French spelling, while transcribing here and there a few words phonetically. Still she has some advantages over her colleague: she gives more examples of forms used in sentences—although still not enough; she has a comparative chapter about the ensemble of the French Creole dialects and she is not entirely blind to possible influences of the African substratum. I would not reproach her, as Hall does among other things,[45] with comparing literary French and French Creole, provided she had done justice to the latter language. I, too, propose to use a kind of comparative method in the following short sketch of Martiniquais grammar—drawn from Mrs Jourdain's books—because I think this the best method to give the reader an idea of a *French* Creole dialect. But I will treat Martiniquais as a fully fledged language and not as a "langage bâtard" or a "hybride"! It matters little whether we choose this particular dialect or another, because the basic unity of Creole French is much greater than that of present-day Creole Portuguese.[46]

As Mrs Jourdain fell victim to her gallomania, we need the assistance of modern linguists such as R. A. Hall and D. Taylor, specialists of Haitian and Dominican Creole respectively, to do justice to the phonological system and the conjugation of Martiniquais.[47] Under their guidance I will now first follow Mrs Jourdain's first book[44] to give the reader the promised little *aperçu*, and afterwards I will draw from her second book some illustrations of what I have just called the "picturesqueness" and "resourcefulness" of Creole.[48]

Beginning with an analysis of the phonological system and comparing it with the French one, let us note that the French intermediate vowels (**ɥ**, **ü**, **ø**, **œ**, "feminine" **ə**) have not survived in any Creole dialect, but that they were reintroduced into Martiniquais under French influence; they were already thriving in the period (1890-1910) described by the authoress. Among the nasal vowels **ẽ** seems to be closed and therefore corresponds to Portuguese — or Creole Portuguese — **ẽ**. Hall observed that in Haitian **ã** is mid-central and not low-central as in metropolitan French, and that this is likely to be also the case in Martiniquais.[49] I may add that on St Thomas island the nasal **ã** in Creole has also grown away from the Portuguese one. Consonants peculiar to Martiniquais Creole are a guttural spirant originating from **r** (in certain other cases **r**>**w**), palatalized **k**, **ǵ**, **t**, **d**, and partly nasalized **b**, **d**, **ǵ**, after nasal vowels; only the first two occur in doublets in opposition with ordinary **k**, and **ǵ**, so that they have phonological value.

In the declension the definite and partitive

[42] *Haitian Créole: Grammar, Texts, Vocabulary*, by Robert A. Hall, Jr., with the collaboration of Suzanne Comhaire-Sylvain, H. Ormonde Mc Connell, Alfred Métraux. The American Anthropological Association, Vol. 55, No. 2, Part 2, Memoir 74, Menasha, 1953. This is an entirely synchronic description of the dialect in question and the author has the honour of being the first investigator to apply the principles of structural linguistics to the study of Creole.

[43] *Le créole haïtien. Morphologie et syntaxe*, Wetteren (Belgium), 1936.

[44] *Du français aux créoles* (I) and *Le vocabulaire du parler créole de la Martinique* (II), both, Paris, 1956.

[45] In his review of the book in *Language*, XXXIII (1957), pp. 226-231.

[46] S. Jones (*art. cit.*, p. 244) tells the anecdote of two Seychellois who were dumbfounded when they discovered that a Martiniquaise stenographer had understood their secret conversation in a Paris business house and addressed them in a language similar to theirs.

[47] D. Taylor's review of Mrs Jourdain's book can be found in *Word*, XIII (1957), pp. 357-368.

[48] I will use a very simple phonetic transcription which is intelligible to a connoisseur of French and a linguist in general.

[49] *art. cit.*, p. 227.

articles are lacking, but many nouns still present agglutinated (fixed) forms, e.g. **lãmè** "mer", **lajã** "argent", **ã dló klè** "une eau claire", **ã bõ düvẽ** "un bon vin". Both the French gender and plural have disappeared but can be rendered by various means. Thus *une cane*, the feminine of French *canard* "a duck", became **ã mãmã cãna**, and **mwẽ lé ni ã yiš** "je veux avoir un enfant" made a plural **mwẽ lé ni yiš**, simply omitting the indefinite article, and these are only two examples from a great wealth of possibilities. Just as in Creole Portuguese,[50] possession is marked by postposition of the personal pronoun (or the owner); with a singular possessor: **papa-w** "ton papa (**w**<**ou**<**vous**) or, with more possessors: **šãb zót** "votre chambre" (**zót** contracted from *vous autres*). The possessive pronouns proper are formed by **ta** with the relevant personal ones: **ta-mwẽ** "le mien" (**ta** perhaps *c'est à*, but assimilated to an African affix). The demonstratives usually show a suffix **la** after a consonant and **a** after a vowel for propinquity and **tala**, **taa** for distance, while the noun is preposed by **sé** (French *ces*) in the plural; with **pul** "poule" (hen): **pul-la**, **pul-tala**, **sé-pul-la**, **sé-pul-tala**. For the demonstrative pronouns proper, the particle **ta** is used again: **mwẽ wè sulyé-w, mè mwẽ pa wè ta sœ-w** "je vois tes souliers, mais je ne vois pas ceux de ta soeur". No difference exists between subject an object personal pronouns; *elle* and *il* are both **i** (or **y** if used enclitically). "The system of the relative pronouns has been extremely degraded in Creole", sighs Mrs Jourdain,[51] because French *dont*, *où* and a lot of others have vanished. But mark that Martiniquais Creole is able to render all these connections in its own fashion; so for *dont* the sentence "la personne dont je vous ai parlé" has become: **moun-la mwẽ palé-w la**, i.e. "personne (lit.: le monde) là moi parle vous là", whereby we should not forget that **la** must have kept something of the signification and use of its West African homonym.

The conjugation is the most interesting part of Creole grammar, because it shows such profound difference from the French tradition. The whole system of African verbal prefixes can be rediscovered in Creole, although some of the particles are of French confection. We find of course the unique verbal stem without prefix (=perfective present or past), **té** + verb (=past), **ké** (or **a**) + verb (=future), **té ké** (or **sé**) + verb (=conditional or optative), **ka** + verb (=progressive present), **té ka** + verb (progressive past). There is a remarkable distinction—existing also in St Thomas Creole Portuguese—between abstract and concrete verbs, the latter using **ka**, the former omitting it: **mwẽ ka mãžé** "je mange" and **mwẽ ẽmé** "j'aime". The imperative is the uninflected verb for the 2nd person singular and plural, but the 1st person plural prefixes the curious particle **ãnu**, e.g.: **ãnu sòti mézãmi**! "sortons, mes amis".[52] Of course, the main innovation in the conjugation is that the African aspects prevailed over the French tenses. Mrs Jourdain had an inkling of this truth when she introduced with her classical categories of French tenses, expressions for such "oddities" as an action which has nearly been accomplished, the "failed imminence" of an action, the action that is being accomplished, that is habitual or that is situated outside time.

In syntax one of the salient features is the possible substitution of any part of speech for another, and this to a much greater extent than in the Indo-European languages.[53] In **i pa kapab fè la šarité** "il ne peut (veut) pas faire l'aumône", there is no ellepsis of a form of the verb *être*, to be, but the original adjective **kapab** "capable" is synchronistically employed as a verb. The same happens with the original adverb

[50] See examples in my second article.
[51] I, p. 113.
[52] Mrs Comhaire derives this article from Picardian *anons* "allons" (*op. cit.*, p. 139), Mrs Jourdain from *c'est à nous de . . .* (*op. cit.*, I, p. 157).
[53] In this respect Afrikaans too is much freer than Dutch. Here is a recent and picturesque example of such a change of grammatical category (a noun becoming verb): "Hy (=die perd) steek vas en *spoetnik* sy ruiter in die rigting van moeder aarde" (*Die Vaderland*, 11. 10. 60).

ajunu "à genoux" in the meaning "s'agenouiller", to kneel down, while, diachronistically, the obsolete phrase **sümié**<"c'est mieux" got the sense of "préférer", to prefer. In the same way many old past pasticiples are used as verbal stems in Creole varieties, e.g. **mò** (=mort) and **sufè** (=souffert) in Martiniquais, but they can of course also fulfil any other function in a sentence. Thus **ba** "donner" corresponds to one of our prepositions in **pòt sa ba papa-w** "apporte cela à ton pere" and likewise we find verbal derivatives for nouns e.g. **pãdrioš**, which according to Mrs Jourdain comes from *pendre* and *pendeloque*,[54] "something that hangs unhappily, peeps from under the dress". Even whole sub-clauses are submitted for adjectives: **ã lòtèl malzòrèy**, a disreputable hotel, that is to say "un hôtel qui a mal aux oreilles"! Among the many other syntactical particularities, let us finally cite the repetition of the adjective or adverb to express an absolute superlative: **i piti, piti, piti, piti**! "he is extremely small", and the creation of a new system of prepositions and relations after the disappearance of the common prepositions *de* and *à*.

Instead of continually comparing the Creole variety with its "mother tongue" and deploring its "impoverishment" students of Creole should examine its creative power, which is enormous.[55] Moreover the etymology of several words gives us an insight into life in the old colonies and the social relations between masters and slaves. Let us consider for instance the concepts of "to leave" and "to hold". In what psychological and linguistic context were they used in the plantations? Most probably in imperatives with the desire to be quickly obeyed. The master who did not want to see his servant any longer, simply said: *fous le camp!* "go to hell!",[56] and when he gave him something to hold in his hand he said emphatically: "tiens bien"! Hence we still have **fukã** and **kyẽbé** in Martiniquais, which have now become quite fashionable verbs. When one skims through the authoress's vocabulary one is struck at every moment by the intelligent manner in which the Creoles have accepted, rejected or adapted the French stock. In fact, "each word has its history", as one of the first French linguists said, and time does not allow me to present a number of terms in detail. But let us take a few instances. French *dégingandé*, (person of) ungainly build, did not confer anything to the Creole and when he had to render this idea he used his own name for a long and thin fish (the *athlennes hians*) and created **grã lãgyal.** Had he to render the new concepts of (*vin*) *capiteux*, heady wine, or (*homme*) *tempérant*, temperate (man), what was easier for him than to make: **i ka mõt a tèt**, literally: "cela vous monte à la tête" and **i pa ka bwè**, literally: "il ne boit pas"! More seldom he borrowed a word from one of the American or his own African vernaculars, when it concerned a speciality of his country of origin or his new land, or some familiar or intimate concept: **varé**, (to) harpoon (Caribbean) or **gogo**, bottom (African).

In 1880 A. Bos, one of the first students of Creole French and a Mauritian himself (if I am not mistaken), wrote that Creole was born there "where French emigrants found themselves in continuous contact with a population of inferior race, especially with the Negroes".[57] He then went on: "The limited intelligence (esprit borné) of these races, unable to seize the nuances of French, and their inability to pronounce certain sounds, have transformed the phonology and still more the morphology and syntax of French".[58] Further on he even called his native Creole a "formless patois"[59] and said of its conjugation that this is the part of

[54] II, p. 108. In accordance with the verbal use of **mò**, we see a partial shift of category in Afrikaans *hy is dood* for *hy het gesterwe* (with the Dutch adjective *dood*).

[55] For that matter this remark also applies to Afrikaans which for similar reasons is still looked down upon by a number of speakers of Dutch.

[56] Mrs Jourdain derives it from a first person singular (I, p. 100). but an imperative is much likelier.

[57] "Note sur le Créole que l'on parle à l'île Maurice, ancienne île de France," *Romania*, IX (1880), pp. 571-578. The quoted sentence on p. 571.

[58] *ibidem*, p. 571.

[59] *ibidem*, p. 572.

grammar "where Creole has most mutilated French".[60] He concluded that "there only remains a skeleton which does not give any idea of the beauty of forms of the original language" (i.e. literary French)[61] and that there is not a trace of African influence in the process of creation of Creole French. Nevertheless, owing to a sort of morbid fascination—not uncommon among white students of the ways and customs of the black in Southern Africa—he devoted to this linguistic monster an article which is still considered to be one of the "classics" on French Creole and is quoted with respect by most linguists dealing with this topic.

I would not have mentioned this antiquated article, if the author's three great prejudices had not continued to appear regularly under the pen of students of Creole in the first half of this century. The alleged inferiority of the African peoples and their languages, the idea that these corrupted the cultural languages into shapeless (Creole) jargons and the denial of any constructive influence of the African substratum have become common property among a number of present-day linguists. Thus, whereas the continental dialects have come into fashion and are now worthy objects of study for the dialectologist, the Creole varieties are still the stepchildren of linguistics. Even serious scholars treated them with a certain disdain, although they were undoubtedly captivated by their subject, and probably without being actually aware of it they spoke of "baragouin" (=gibberish)[62] and "langage hybride".[63] J. L. M. Franken who — as we saw[64]—was not biased against Creole, nonetheless called the Portuguese *lingua franca* "Bastard-Portuguese" (viz. Basterportugees in Afrikaans), while sometimes accepting D. C. Hesseling's neutral term of "Malayo-Portuguese" (Maleis-Portugees). It is quite clear that the cultured Creoles themselves prefer the literary French or Portuguese to their own "patois"; even objective scholars among them like B. Lopes da Silva and Elodie Jourdain fell victims to this preconceived opinion.[65] R. de Sá Nogueira, who is a noted linguist and a Bantuologist, fought similar prejudices about Creole when he prefaced Lopes da Silva's book. He cites a 19th century administrator who had called Capeverdian Creole i.a. "a ridiculous jargon" (gíria ridícula) and "gibberish" (algarávia), had denied it a grammar and derived it from corrupted 16th century Portuguese. Sá Nogueira refutes (briefly) these misconceptions, because, as he observes: "unfortunately there are even nowadays people who speak about the subject as the author of the "Ensaios" did a century ago",[66] which is perfectly true.

I, too, should like to break a lance here in favour of the Creole dialects. To put it shortly:

(*a*) They are reproached with their African descent. But every scholar who has studied one or more African languages will agree that these are far from being "primitive", or inferior to Indo-European ones. Their system of prefixation and alliterative or assonating concords presents great advantages over the European system of flexional concords, which has usually become defective in our day. The *aspects* in their conjugation are as good as—though different from—the tenses in ours, and for that matter tenses are not completely lacking in most African languages. They have extensive vocabularies—so they are not at all "poor tongues," —and possess means of deriving verbs and nouns by affixes which can compare favourably with those of Esperanto!

(*b*) Now what happened when speakers of such an African language came into contact with an Indo-European one? They would of course adapt the stock of new and unknown forms and words to their own linguistic habits, i.e. their phonological sys-

[60] *ibidem*, p. 575.
[61] *ibidem*, p. 577.
[62] F. Brunot, *op. cit.*, 1127.
[63] E. Jourdain, *op. cit.*, I, p. XXI and *passim*.
[64] See our second article, especially the end.
[65] For Lopes da Silva, see the passage I devoted to his book in my second article; for Mrs Jourdain, note 63 in the present article.
[66] In his "Prólogo" to B. Lopes da Silva's *O dialecto de Cabo Verde*, Lisbon, 1957.

tem and the internal structure ("innere Sprachform") of their mother tongue. Here, as L. Lichtveldt says, "the criteria are the main rules of the grammar [of the Negroes], the syntactical particularities, the system of used and avoided sounds, of usual and unusual combinations of sounds".[67] In this way the African assimilated the new language and adjusted it to his vernacular, but this did not mean an impoverishment or a deterioration: it was rather a profound blending. Thus a *mixed language* had come into being[68] which presented several characteristics of the African language and the greater part of the vocabulary of the European tongue.

(*c*) It is understandable that French and Portuguese nationalists were unable to perceive the African substratum, the more so as in recent times a process of "de-africanization" has in fact taken place, as I showed in my second article. Nevertheless, even some of the early investigators were aware of the African warp which combined with the European woof to make the Creole cloth. Most interesting is the case of Lucien Adam, a French magistrate and an amateur linguist. He had been a government official in Cayenne for three years and had learnt Creole French there. When afterwards he skimmed through studies on West African languages by Friedrich Müller and others, he was struck by the resemblances between these tongues and Guiana Creole. After having verified whether the West Indian Negroes had actually come from that part of Africa, he mastered the details of some of their languages and wrote a book which still has its value for present-day researchers and which should have opened the eyes of many a student of Creole.[69] It is true that in our time scholars such as Mrs Comhaire-Sylvain or L. Gáldi (Göbl) have given the African influences their due.[70]

Our great problem is whether to give preference to the phenomena of conservation (archaisms), originating from older phases of the cultural language or from its dialects, or to the phenomena of progression (innovations), due to the African substratum or to spontaneous developments.[71] One of our best sources for the end of the 19th century Creole of the Mascarenhas is an often quoted and more or less "classical" article by A. Dietrich.[72] In a manner typical of a Neogrammarian this author classified the phonology of Mauritian and Réunionais and derived a great number of particularities from a whole gamut of French dialects, while treating the rest as spontaneous developments. When we now look back at it from our present conception of linguistics, several queries offer themselves to our minds.[73] How could, for instance, the French-learning Malagasy or Negroes have picked up a Picard trait from one master, a Bourguignon one from another and a Saintongeois one from a third, and *have generalized them throughout their community?* And why should such a dialect miscellany have sprung into existence in Reunion and Mauritius and not in Canada and Louisiana, where there were just as many dialect speakers? Moreover, supposing that this had really happened, why does the Creole vocabulary not show a correspondingly extensive dialectal variety, for that is what one would expect on the basis of the phonology? One wonders whether the rest of Dietrich's study is not also too rigid and schematic, where so much is dynamic, irregular and unexpected in these Creole dialects.

---

[67] *art. cit.*, p. 61.

[68] Compare D. C. Hesseling: "Gemengde taal, mengeltaal, Kreools en kreolisering," in *De Nieuwe Taalgids*, XXVIII (1934), pp. 310-322.

[69] Lucien Adam, *Les idiomes négro-aryen et maléo-aryen: Essai d'hybridologie linguistique*, Paris, 1883. See also Schuchardt's critical review in *Literaturblatt f. germ. u. rom. Phil. IV* (1883) c. 236-240.

[70] *op. cit.*

[71] I myself characterized the Walloon dialects in a similar fourfold way, dividing typical traits into "conservatismes," "innovations," "idiotismes" and "germanismes" (*Philologie et Littérature wallonnes*, Groningen, Batavia, 1938, pp. 74-82).

[72] "Les parlers créoles des Mascareignes," in *Romania*, XX (1891), pp. 216 f.

[73] In the same way we should reconsider the whole problem of the relationship between Creole Portuguese and Cape Dutch, where similar methods and arguments were used to disprove the influence of the slave language.

Applying to French Creole the foregoing linguistic division, L. Gáldi came to interesting conclusions.[74] As pure conservatisms he cites cases of **wé** or **wè** for French **wa** (written *oi*) in Martinique (**dwé**, "devoir"),[75] Trinidad (**étwèt**. "étroit"), the Mascarenhas (**bwèt**, "boîte"), and the preservation of final **t** in Martinique (**let**, "lait", **ravet**, diminutive of "rave", **vert**). Dialectisms, perhaps due to Norman sailors, seem to be the change of **è** into **i** in Mauritius (**oryé**, "oreiller"), Trinidad (**ridé**, "aider") and the aspirated **h** becoming **r**: **ronté**, "honteux" (Cayenne), **rad**, "hardes" (Trinidad). Among innovations of the first type (viz. caused by African influences) the author rightly counts the plural of the noun formed by adding the 3rd person plural of the personal pronoun, to which I referred in my second article[76] (**bitachõ-yé-la**, "ces maisons" (Cayenne), where **yé** represents French *eux*), and the comparative degree rendered by a following "passed" (**u grã pasé li**, literally "vous êtes grand passé lui"). Of course, transformations have been greatest in the verbal system, as we have already seen, and Gáldi has no hesitation in ascribing them to the African substratum. So we have found an impartial arbiter who confirms what L. Adam and others had already noticed, but what most students of Creole had consistently denied.

Every Romanicist, well informed about the Roman conquests and the consequent romanization of the Provinces, must be struck by a remarkable resemblance when he studies the colonial expansion of the West European nations and the creolization of their languages in the mouth of aborigines and slaves. Seventeen to nineteen centuries before, the Roman Empire (and at the beginning, the Republic) had been subduing all the countries round the Mediterranean and thrusting its language, administration and customs on the foreign people. In a first stage a Latin *koinê* sprang up, soon slightly differentiated in the various Provinces, then, in a second stage, these regional differences gave birth to the Romance languages. Both in the Roman Imperium and the colonial empires the exported languages underwent deep changes and in several cases entirely new tongues originated from it. Can we accept the idea of a "creolization" of Latin—either primary or secondary—when it was being more and more spoken by the "barbarians" whom the Empire endeavoured to romanize? In certain cases, e.g. in the vassal states of Arabia (Nabataea), Mauretania, Crimaea and in Nubia the ethnic differences must have been nearly as great as between Portuguese and Red Indians or French and Negroes. However, these were precisely the countries where the Romans did not succeed in imposing their language . . . Mrs Jourdain's argument that in contrast with early Romance the Creole dialects were only "bastard languages, compromises accepted —if not created—by the victor in order to make himself understood"[77] does not hold. At the beginning of each Roman occupation the emergency languages that sprang up must have corresponded more or less to that very definition and Vulgar Latin (the Latin *koinê*) has kept many features which we would now call "phenomena of creolization" and which we find again in that other great *koinê*, the Portuguese *lingua franca*. But soon after these early years of romanization the comparison ceases to be valid, because then schools where Classical Latin was to be taught, were founded and a general reaction started against the centrifugal tendencies of Vulgar Latin.[78] It was only much later again, after the invasions of the Germans in the 4th and 5th centuries and the progressive disintegration of the Empire, that the Romance languages "were born" (2nd stage). Still we possess interesting parallels drawn by competent linguists, between the Latin *koinê* (1st stage) and American Spanish on the one hand (M. L.

[74] *art. cit.*
[75] This is the right form, and not *devoue*, see E. Jourdain, *op. cit.*, I, p. 129.
[76] p. 113 and note 5.
[77] *op. cit.*, I, p. VII.
[78] See I. J. Haarhoff: *Schools of Gaul: A Study of Pagan and Christian Education in the last century of the Western Empire*, reprint, Johannesburg, 1958.

Wagner[79]), and Vulgar Latin and Afrikaans on the other (T. J. Haarhoff[80]). The idea is that when we compare American Spanish with Castillian Spanish, or Afrikaans with "High-Dutch", and Vulgar Latin with Classical Latin, we encounter a number of special developments which the two groups have in common. After Haarhoff, I myself listed a dozen analogies between Afrikaans and Vulgar Latin, the most interesting of which is the use of the demonstrative pronoun (*ille*; *die*) as an article and the correlative creation of a new demonstrative with the aid of adverbs meaning "here, there" (*ecce, atque, accum, eccum*; *hier, daar*) plus this new article (*eccilli, accuille*, etc.; *hierdie, daardie*).[81] But in my opinion the comparison ends at this first stage and the rise of the Romance languages is an event in its own right.[82]

In conclusion, I should like to say a few words about the popularity of the Creole varieties as written languages and their relation to literary French. According to P. Zumthor, the relationship between French and Creole is not truly comparable to the one between French and dialect as we encounter it in the French provinces, because in the former case (i.e. for Creole) we have "a living superstratum of an academic nature covering the area of a language which has become extraneous to it, although it proceeds from it to a great extent".[83] From a genetic point of view this may be true, but from a social standpoint I find the analogies in the two cases to be striking. In each we have an official language spoken by the upper classes, and dialects or patois—Creole or ordinary ones—by the lower classes. Just as in some French provinces we encounter a dialect literature, we also come across texts in Creole. In a few regions of the French speaking continent—especially in Wallonia[84] — this regionalistic movement has even acquired a certain strength and vivacity, whereas the cultivation of the Creole dialects has been handicapped by the colour prejudice of the whites (the reading and writing population of the colony), the backwardness of the coloured Creoles themselves, and probably also by the "indolence créole" in general. Still both Elodie Jourdain and Paul Zumthor cite some Martiniquais and Haitian works respectively,[85] and written specimens of African Creole are not lacking either, though they are relatively rare. The fact remains that here and there some white Creole has been attracted by the "curious lingo" of his servants or that some educated coloured Creole has felt the urge to write verse in his native tongue. Now this is more or less what likewise happened in the French provinces, where the dialect literature presents the same artificial and accidental character cultivated as it is by "eccentric" intellectuals (a village doctor, notary public or schoolmaster), and—usually—not by the dialect speakers themselves. Moreover both continental and Creole dialects are slowly but surely becoming extinct through a gradual process of gallicization. The French language with its outstanding qualities of clarity and versatility, its literature and its tradition, is too overpowering a competitor for the poor dialects. It is only where the Creole community wishes to distinguish or affirm itself by a special language that the local Creole stands a chance, but even in that case—for instance in Haiti—metropolitan French still constitutes a real danger.[86]

[79] "Amerikanisch-Spanisch und Vulgärlatein," *Zeitschr. f. rom. Phil.*, XLIV, pp. 309 f.

[80] *Afrikaans: Its Origin and Development*, Oxford, 1936, p. 16-18. The author also summarizes D. C. Hesseling's "Malayo-Portuguese theory" and then adds: "But Professor D. B. Bosman of the University of Capetown has analysed the fallacies of this explanation and propounded his own theory which has found fairly general acceptance among philologists" (p. 25). This sentence very neatly formulates the "official truth" in South Africa.

[81] M. Valkhoff: *De Expansie van het Nederlands*, 3rd. ed., The Hague, 1945, pp. 100-102.

[82] See my *Latijn, Romaans, Roemeens*, Amersfoort, 1932.

[83] *art. cit.*, p. 14.

[84] See my *Philologie et Littérature wallonnes*, Groningen, Batavia, 1938. Chapter III.

[85] Respectively *op. cit.*, I, pp. 234 f., and *art. cit.*, pp. 14-16.

[86] In concluding this series of "Contributions to the Study of Creole," I wish to thank my friend Mr M. Shackleton, Senior Lecturer in French in the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, for having read through the three articles and improved style and clarity by his valuable suggestions.

NOTES AND NEWS

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED FOR REVIEW

The Editorial Committee gratefully acknowledges receipt of the publications listed below, during the period July 1, to September 30, 1960. Reviews are published as circumstances permit, but no undertaking can be given that every book received will be reviewed in *African Studies*

ALLOTT, Antony: *Essays in African Law with special reference to the law of Ghana.* Butterworth & Co., London. 1960.

BENTWICH, Norman: *The Jews in our Time.* Penguin Books Ltd., Harmondsworth. 1960.

DELANỌ, Isaac O.: *Àgbékà Ọrọ Yoruba.* (Appropriate words and Expressions in Yoruba). Oxford University Press, London. 1960.

FIELD, M. J.: *Search for Security: An ethno-psychiatric study of rural Ghana.* Faber & Faber, London. 1960.

GOULD, Peter R.: *The Development of the Transportation Pattern in Ghana.* Department of Geography, Northwestern University, Illinois. 1960.

HANNAN, M.: *Standard Shona Dictionary.* MacMillan & Co. Ltd., London. 1959.

HOBSON, R. H.: *Rubber: A footnote to Northern Rhodesian History.* The Rhodes-Livingstone Museum, Livingstone, N.R. 1960.

HUGHES, Emmet John: *America the Vincible.* Penguin Books Ltd., Harmondsworth. 1960.

JAMES, John: *Why Evil?* Penguin Books Ltd., Harmondsworth. 1960.

KUO, Ping-chia: *China: New Age and New Outlook.* Penguin Books Ltd., Harmondsworth. 1960.

MCBURNEY, C. B. M.: *The Stone Age of Northern Africa.* Penguin Books Ltd., Harmondsworth. 1960.

MITCHELL, J. C.: *Tribalism and the Plural Society.* Oxford University Press, London. 1960.

OLIVER, R. A., and FAGE, J. D. (Eds): *The Journal of African History,* I, 1, 1960. Cambridge University Press, London. 1960.

SAUNDERS, J. T.: *University College Ibadan.* Cambridge University Press, London. 1960.

SHEPHERD, R. H. W. and MDLEDLE, B. B. (Translator): *Abazibaluleyo noKubhaliweyo ngesiNtu.* The Lovedale Press, Lovedale. 1960.

SIMOONS, Frederick J.: *Northwest Ethiopia: Peoples and Economy.* The University of Wisconsin Press, Madison. 1960.

STORRY, Richard: *A History of Modern Japan.* Penguin Books Ltd., Harmondsworth. 1960.

SUMMERS, Roger, F.S.A. (Ed.): *Prehistoric Rock Art of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland.* Chatto and Windus Ltd., Salisbury. 1959.

SUTTIE, Ian D.: *The Origins of Love and Hate.* Penguin Books Ltd., Harmondsworth. 1960.

WHITE, C. M. N.: *An Outline of Luvale Social and Political Organization.* Rhodes-Livingstone Paper No. 30. Manchester University Press, Manchester. 1960.

BOOK REVIEWS

A Short Description of Item Categories in Iraqw. W. H. WHITELEY. East African Institute of Social Research, Kampala, Uganda. 1958. 75 pp., texts.

This book is devoted mainly to describing aspects of the grammatic structure of Iraqw accompanied by brief comparisons with closely-related Gorowa, Alagwa and Burunge. Although few linguists would be prepared to employ a term with so vague a reference as "item" (it can apparently be applied indiscriminately to words, or parts of words comprising one or more morphs), "item categories" are roughly equatable to "form-classes" (or "parts of speech") and this study is chiefly concerned with categorizing words. The analysis of the higher levels of the morphologic structure is developed to a limited extent, although the author isolates morphs and portions of morphs without distinction. The arrangements of members of various item categories in sentences is treated briefly and there is a description of "phonetic structure" (that nevertheless identifies "phonemes"), which is not sufficient to convince that the analysis of the grammatic structure rests on firm foundations. Five texts with English translations are provided and there are lists of "nominals" and "verbals".

Iraqw is a non-Bantu language of Tanganyika classified by Greenberg (*Studies in African Linguistic Classification*, New Haven, 1955, p. 51) as "Cushite", but by Tucker and Bryan as an "Isolated Language Group" because of " . . . the highly complex system of 'Conjugation Particles' preceding the Verb, i.e. indivisible Particles which express both Person and Tense, which mark out Iraqw as differing from any other known language, and make it impossible to regard it as anything but a member of an Isolated Language Group". (*The Non-Bantu Languages of North-Eastern Africa*, Oxford University Press, 1956, p. 157.) Other linguists are not likely to find the following table of "indivisible particles"[1] convincing evidence of indivisibility, on which the classification is apparently based. The failure to see through to the deeper levels of the morphologic structure likewise mars the description of the structure of Iraqw which is reviewed here.

	1	2	3	4	5
1st person, Sing. and Pl.	á	án	ana	aga	niri* / tari
2nd person, Sing. and Pl. . .	á	án	ana	aga	tari
3rd person, Series A 1.	í	ín	ina	aa	iri
2.	í	ín	ina	aa	iri
3.	í	ín	nina	naa	niri
4.	tá	—	tana	taa	tari
Series B 1.	ǥá	ǥán	ǥana	ǥaa	ŋiri
2.	ǥá	ǥán	ǥana	ǥaa	ŋiri
3.	ŋí	ŋín	ŋína	ŋaa	ŋiri
4.	ká	—	kana	kaa	kari

*(Singular and plural are said to be differentiated.)

[1] Whiteley applies the term "selectors" to the" Conjugation Particles". The table shows the first five sets of "subject selectors" that he lists in the manner in which he lists them, apart from minor adjustments necessary in quoting these forms out of context. The sets numbered from 1 to 5 show differences according to tense and mode or aspect.

Iraqw is well worthy of the attention of linguists because of an intricate grammatic system in which subclasses of nouns, verbs and "selectors" classified according to purely formal criteria (usually a distinguishing suffix) have either no direct correlation with such common grammatic meanings as singular and plural, 1st, 2nd, 3rd person, etc., or are linked with them only partially and somewhat tenuously. These subclasses are orientated more towards a set of concordial relations than towards differences in meaning. Nouns are of particular interest in this respect. At least six of a set of nominal suffixes can have alternatively singular or plural reference which is only determinable morphologically, e.g. **díiraŋw (díir-aŋw)** 'lion', **béeʃaŋw (béeʃ-aŋw)** 'sheep (pl.)'. A complex structure of this kind is a challenge to any linguist and his methods and puts a high premium on methodologic rigour and objectivity. Regrettably the present author lacks a rigorous methodology and employs a terminology lacking both precision and general currency. Unless the reader is, to a large extent, prepared to develop his own analysis as he goes along, much of the essential structure of Iraqw remains obscure.

"Item" provides a good example of the lack of clear definition of a much-used term. On p. 2 it is defined as follows: "In the process of analysing a given body of text, successively smaller lengths of complete utterances may be isolated until no further subdivision is possible. Such minimal meaningful units I define as items—stable items, since they may occur in isolation as complete utterances." When it is observed that Bloomfield is cited in a footnote apparently as the source of the phrase "minimal meaningful units", and most Iraqw words are polymorphemic, the confusion of the reader who is not an adherent of the author's linguistic tradition is readily comprehendible. Confusion mounts as the failure to distinguish between words and constituent morphs is maintained. The following statements appear on p. 28 in connection with "The Verbal": "In the great majority of contexts the verbal consists of two items: . . . a 'selector', and a radical, which may or may not be suffixed thus:

. . . **á haniisán** We give
(Selector + Radical with suffix **-an**)"

Lower down we read: "A radical may be defined as that part of the verbal exclusive of suffix and/or external or internal extension." "Radical" as an "item" is thus either verb or part of a verb.

Although the author shows an awareness of the generally-accepted premise which assigns form a priority over meaning in grammatic analysis, it is precisely the mixing of the two as criteria of analysis that makes for a confusing presentation. The description of "nominals" is tortuous because of a consistent endeavour to classify under the headings of "singular" and "plural" without first developing a basic classification of nouns according to the suffixes which, from the aspect of singular and plural meaning, are arbitrarily assigned. From the confusing mass of data on pp. 12 and 13 the following nominal suffixes are identifiable without much difficulty: **-i** (5xS, 2xP), **-ay** (3xP), **-a** (7xS, 3xP), **-o** (4xS, 5xP), **-Ø** (4xP), **-e** (1xS, 3xP), **-u** (1xS, 3xP), **-âwe** (3xP), **-mo** (12xS), **-ee** (also appearing in **-eeri** and **-eema**, 8xP), **-du** (1xP), **-aŋw** (3xS, 1xP). Brackets contain the approximate number of times each appears in nouns of singular reference (S), and nouns of plural reference (P) on these pages. It is clear from this that a classification according to number is an unsatisfactory mould into which to force the data and attempts to do so have a natural result in wasteful and inexact description such as the following statement on the categorization of "nominals" of "Group 1":

"In this group are singular nominals with final

-mo (including **-smo**)[2]
-aŋw
-a
-ay
-u

[2] Note that **-mo** is one of the few nominal suffixes which are associated exclusively with singular reference. **s** is part of a derivational morpheme **-us**.

and plural nominals with final

-ay
-Consonant
-ŋw
-u"

(The consequences of ignoring morphologic boundaries when defining subclasses according to formal criteria should be noted here—**béeʃaŋw** 'sheep' is the only example given of a "plural nominal" with "final **-ŋw**". This defect is discussed again below.)

Under "Invariable Items" (p. 57) are included: "6. Adjective; 7. Prepositions; 8. Connectors; 9. Items of time; 10. Items of manner; 11. Items of place; 12. Interrogative items." Morphologic form, distribution and meaning are all criteria in this classification and as a result "**gámú** Under" and "**gáwá** Above" as "Prepositions" (7) reappear under "Items of Place" (11), viz.: "**Gâmu** (*sic*) Under, **Gáwá** Above".

The data on "The Verbal" reveals a preponderance of verbal phrases comprising: (*a*) A "selector" comprised of two morphemes; the one selected from a set of 6 or 7 according to person and the subclass of the subject noun: the other denoting tense, aspect, etc., or even 'even though'; (*b*) A verb incorporating one or two suffixes. In the description and paradigmatic presentation of the latter the need to qualify statements on distribution by inserting "generally", and the repetition of identical forms, suggest that an endeavour to maintain a correlation with person, sex, number and subclass (3 in number) of noun subjects does not make for the simplest classification that can be made of these forms. There are only three immediate inflexions of the verbal root **daq-**, viz.: **daqáw, daqeér, daqayá**. Other subclasses have only two such inflexions.

The aspect of this work conveying the most unfavourable impression is that of description of the higher levels of the grammatic structure of a highly synthetic language, without a thorough analysis of the lower levels. A description of this kind is essentially a matter of reassembling what has already been thoroughly broken down. The reader frequently observes morpheme boundaries which pass without reference in a preoccupation with "final vowels" and consonants. An example of this has already been noted above, viz. firstly **-aŋw** recognized as a criterion for classifying nouns and later **-ŋw**, although all the evidence points to the latter being but a part of the former, i.e. the suffix **-aŋw**. The table of "selectors" given earlier reveals a similar tendency to ignore inflectional as well as derivational affixes, a neglect that can only result in more complex description. The intricacies of Iraqw structure include suppletion, replacive morphemes, discontinuous morphemes and (probably) tonomorphemes, and although there is talk of "internal changes" and spasmodic observations are made on tonetic differences, scant attention is paid to the less easily discernible units of the morphologic structure.

The effect on this reviewer of seeing the author trapped by the snares which the methodology of modern descriptive linguistics signposts so clearly for the analyst, is an urge to get to grips with the structure of Iraqw himself. Other linguists will probably feel the same way because of the stimulating test for their methods that Iraqw offers. It has already been suggested that the reader develops his own analysis and the copious data allows for this. Many conclusions must remain tentative and incomplete, however, because the interpretation of the sound material is suspect for a number of reasons. There is, for example, a tendency to mix levels, e.g.: "In some of these radicals [e.g. **huuríím** in which **ii** represents a long vowel —L.W.L.] the vowel is longer than in others: cf. **wahám — wahán — wahán**, Smoke a pipe, where the terminal vowel is only a little longer than a short vowel." Grammatic description is interspersed with such references to phonetic differences. Serious doubts must be entertained regarding the phonetic and phonemic identity of certain symbols, e.g. **w** in a form such as **Iraŋw**. Is **w** before and after vowels identical with **w** after consonants? If so, the latter has a most unusually restricted distribution, occurring only after velar consonants and uvular **q**. **ss** may reflect the association with consonants of a contrastive length feature that

is prominently associated with vowels. What **hh** (p. 46) represents, however, is difficult to imagine. Voicing "in the region of the epiglottis" (p. 7) will also require interpretation for most linguists.

It is a matter of real regret that so much of the value of a vast amount of field-work has been lost in the analysis and its presentation. The author is an authority in what is probably the most sparsely documented area in African linguistics. If he could be persuaded to improve his methodology, this major gap would be filled so much more effectively.

L. W. LANHAM
Rhodes University
Grahamstown

A Study of the Logbara (Ma'di) Language: Grammar and Vocabulary. J. P. CRAZZOLARA. Oxford University Press for the International African Institute, London. 1960. xvii+373 pp., 42s.

This is an account of a language classified by Greenberg as Central Sudanic and associated with the Ma'di group. It is spoken by 200,000 people in north-western Uganda and an adjoining part of the Congo. The work consists of an outline grammar and a vocabulary. From a statement in the Acknowledgements, we infer that the work was completed under trying external circumstances, and that the author would have liked, had it been possible, to have done much more work on the manuscript before publishing it. We are in debt to Fr Crazzolara for making available such a large quantity of information about Logbara.

The work opens with three chapters titled Sounds, Intonation and Morphological Notes. Next follows the main body of the grammar, with chapters on The Noun, Adjectives, Numerals, Pronouns, The Copula, Verb, Conjunctions, Postpositions, Adverbs and Interjections. A long appendix brings together information about certain grammatical matters which were treated in part in various places throughout the preceding chapters.

The Vocabulary, which fills 200 pages, indicates tones and provides one or more illustrative phrases for each entry.

Fr Crazzolara's recognition of the importance of tone in Logbara enables him to deal with the tonal inflection of the verb, and to give an illuminating description of the contrasting structures which he labels "Construction of Completed Action" and "Construction of Incompleted Action." Each of these constructions is used in its own set of tenses. They differ from one another not only in the tones of the verb itself, but also in the form of the subject pronoun, the relative order of subject, verb and direct object, and in the presence or absence of particles after a noun-subject.

The author evidently possesses a wide and intimate acquaintanceship with Logbara. Yet the work under review at times fails to convey his knowledge to the reader. The description might have been more successful in this respect if it had been related to a more adequate and fully-developed theoretical framework.

An example from the chapter on Sounds is the treatment of **ɛ** and **e**. We are told (§ 5) that "apparently . . . the difference between **ɛ** and **e** does not serve to distinguish words." Yet the vocabulary yields numerous pairs of words such as **érú** (interj.), **ɛ̀rù** (vulture) and **erí** (tighten), **ɛrí** (delay) which point toward treating **e** and **ɛ** as phonemically distinct. We cannot be entirely certain, however, for the author warns us (p. 175) that "a word may be written differently in various places [throughout the book] because various words are actually in use or because, to some extent, the pronunciation often is not very clear." Thus, a word for 'uncooked' is given in § 141 as **àmorɛ̀**, but in the Vocabulary as **àmorè**. Comparable inconsistencies are not infrequent. Do they represent dialect differences? If so, are the differences comparable to the differences between American and British pronunciations of *clerk*, *ate*? Or are they comparable to the difference between pronunciations of *ten* with dental *vs.* alveolar /t/? What are we to conclude about such apparent minimal pairs as **erí-ɛrí**? Uncertainty also clouds the relationships among other pairs of vowels, and makes

unclear the status of the consonants written with double letters. At such points, the description—and possibly also the author's own observations—might have been clarified if carried out with reference to such concepts as phonemic contrast, allophonic and diaphonic variants.

With respect to grammar, the test of a linguistic description lies, of course, not in the terminology which it uses, nor in the principle around which it is organized, whether "formal" or "semantic" or other. What counts is the information which it conveys concerning the language, and the readiness with which it makes that information available to the reader. A good description organized on an ostensibly semantic basis may be converted into one organized around "form" by the industrious and ingenious use of "mental scissors and paste."

The dominant question around which the present grammatical description is organized seems to be "What is the Logbara way of rendering such-and-such an Indo-European part of speech or grammatical construction?" At times, to be sure, the author seems intent on direct description of the inherent structure of the language:

> "The two conjugations **kà** pl. **ká** and **kànì** introduce clauses of condition. It should be noted, however, that this section deals with the mentioned conjugations, and with clauses of classical grammars only insofar as they coincide." (§ 458)

Much more frequently, however, we are given ways of "expressing the genitive case," or "indicating the dative case," or of "rendering verbal adjectives and verbal nouns," and the like. To what extent does the resulting description convey information which is detailed enough and clear enough to be capable of reorganization on the basis of form?

As far as the broad outlines of the language are concerned, we encounter no serious difficulty. Furthermore, the description of the crucial constructions of "completed" and "incompleted" action are already largely in terms of form, so that no problem arises there. But in his treatment of many of the details, the author is less successful in transmitting to the reader what he himself knows about the language. In part, this seems to be due to the dominant question referred to above, which has allowed the author to overlook, or at least to omit, certain data.

In the following treatment of "the genitive case", for example, the reader would be aided by some knowledge of the phonological or other implications of word division. Word division is written consistently where the first part of the construction is a noun: **ɔ́pí** (chief), **ɔ́pí drí** (chief's). But with pronouns, one of the forms translated 'my' is written now **má-drí**, now **mádrí**, and even (in the discussion of "dative case") **má drí**.

More serious, for the reader who is interested in the details of Logbara grammar, is the treatment of the postpositions themselves. We are told (§ 98) that "as a rule, any one of [four different postpositions] may be used; no difference of meaning is implied," and again (§ 112) that "the use of the three postpositions is left to choice; the meaning remains the same." . . . Although this is what educated Logbara will readily assert . . . yet the present writer feels that '**bâ ní**' seems to imply the idea of '*for* a person' rather than '*of* a person', while '**bá vélé** implies rather '*at* a person's'." Two of the four postpositions listed for "genitive" constructions are identical in form with two of the four postpositions used in "dative" constructions, and a third is identical except for a tonal alternation in the noun which accompanies it.

Now, if the reader is to understand a grammatical construction of *Logbara*, he must know about the *Logbara* construction at least where it is used in larger constructions of the same language, and what substitutions may be made within it at various points. At times, this information can be conveyed most easily and with reasonable adequacy by reference to translation meanings or to Indo-European (IE) grammatical categories. With respect to the postpositional constructions of Logbara, however, a more rigorous and explicit kind of presentation is evidently needed. If, for example, a phrase consisting of the postposition **drí** with any

given noun may always be substituted (with appropriate changes in order, described by the author) for a phrase consisting of the same noun and the postposition **vɛ́lɛ́**, then we need to be told so unequivocally. If, as the author implies, this is not really the case, then we need examples of sentences in which such free interchange is possible, and also of sentences in which one, but not both, may be used. Generalizations should be based not on intuition about meaning or about IE grammatical analogues, but squarely on examples of what people do say and do not say.

A final, comparatively trivial observation has to do with the alphabetization of the Vocabulary. The symbols **e** and **ɛ** are treated as equivalent to one another in determining the order of a word in the list: **érítì** precedes **èrítì**, but **èrù** precedes **éru**. The same is true for the letters **o**, **ə**, and **ö**, and for **i** and **ĩ**. The glottal stop, written with an apostrophe, is apparently ignored altogether in deciding alphabetical arrangement. This style of alphabetization, which is of course by no means confined to the work under review, hardly seems suited to the language, and makes the Vocabulary less easy to use if one wishes to assemble lists of words containing a certain sound. Incidentally, **ŋ** and **ɳ**, which in Logbara stand for allophones of a single phoneme, are alphabetized as separate letters.

A Study of the Logbara Language is a reference grammar, and as such does not provide exercises for the student whose aim is a practical use of the tongue. Its wealth of detail, however, will commend it to those who are interested in comparing Logbara with related languages. Fr Crazzolara is to be thanked for this contribution to African linguistics.

E. Stevick
Scarritt College
Nashville, Tenn.

The Gisu of Uganda. J. S. La Fontaine. Ethnographic Survey of Africa, East Central Africa Part X, International African Institute, London, 1959. viii+68 pp., 2 maps. 9s. 6d.

The writer lived with the Gisu from 1953 to 1955, but nevertheless this account reads more like an old-fashioned ethnographic description, harking back to the past and virtually ignoring the present. For instance, the writer devotes some four pages to traditional 'Religious Beliefs and Rituals', whilst 'Mission Activity and Education' are cursorily dealt with in a third of a page, not in the chapter on religious beliefs but amongst the introductory sections at the beginning of the book before she describes what, by implication, she seems to consider Gisu society 'proper'. There is not a word on the religious and political opposition between the Protestant and Roman Catholic churches, which is as important in Bugisu as in most other parts of Uganda. The Christian churches have created new principles of organization, as have modern political parties, co-operative societies, modern administrative areas such as counties, sub-counties, etc., which were introduced by the Ganda and are still referred to by Ganda terms. Unfortunately this book does not attempt to deal with these aspects of Gisu society, however summarily. Similarly, in the chapter on the economy the reader has to make do with a largely 'traditional' picture. One is casually told that cotton and coffee are the major cash crops and are 'very important in the cash economy of the area' (p. 14), but there is no indication whatever (not even in the section on trade) of the impressive amounts of money which these crops bring into the area placing it among the wealthiest in Uganda. The most astonishing example of this approach is the section on dress. The reader is only told about the nakedness, clothing of animal skins, reed aprons for girls and so forth of the past, but nothing, for example, of the attractive long rustling dresses with bustles, which are current at present. The importance the writer attaches to 'modernity' may be gauged from the fact that her discussion of marriage ceremonies (p. 47) is entirely concerned with the past, whilst a minor reference to *present* practices is relegated to a footnote.

The result of all this is that one gets a picture of the Gisu as they *might* have been a generation or more ago. It is an unrealistic

picture of the present such as Miss La Fontaine must have observed. No one after reading this book would suspect that the mountainous country of the Gisu is covered with coffee trees and bustles with 'modern' activities: people going about on bicycles, in lorries, cars and buses; politicians making speeches in a general election campaign; many small 'Co-op' offices dotted all over, and so forth.

If a writer is not really interested in the present and prefers to reconstruct the past, the least the reader can expect is that this approach is made explicit and that the writer is consistent, for instance, in the use of tenses. Unfortunately in the present volume the reader is confronted with a most confusing description which switches from past to present and back to past tense, often in the same paragraph. For instance, on p. 35 it is stated, in the same paragraph, that 'Sexual offences against . . . [unmarried and married women] *are* treated as transgressions . . . and . . . infringement(s). In cases of rape no punishment *was* made for the offence in itself. The guardian of the woman *had* to be compensated . . . Torn clothing *might have* to be replaced.' Must the reader conclude that the statement in the present tense still applies and refers to the past as well, but that the second statement no longer applies? Does rape no longer occur, or is it merely treated differently nowadays, or perhaps condoned altogether? And so there are far too many instances where the reader is left to guess what is when. Considering that the Ethnographic Survey of Africa is also meant to assist the enquiries of the man of practice (administrator, missionary, etc.), a volume such as this will only strengthen the frequently heard opinion that anthropologists are merely seekers after the romantic past, and are little concerned with the problems of the present. According to the foreword by the editor of the E.S.A. the purpose of the series is 'to present . . . a summary of available information concerning the different peoples of Africa . . .' If that is the aim, then one cannot but conclude that the present volume is a failure.

Miss La Fontaine has published elsewhere an article on modern administrative conditions. If for some reason she considered a reference to these conditions out of place in this book (in spite of the fact that it should be a general survey of existing knowledge), one would have expected this article mentioned in her bibliography; this article must have been on the stocks, if not in the press, when she compiled the bibliography of this volume. This would have made her bibliography, in the words of the editor, 'comprehensive'. Indeed, writers of other volumes in the E.S.A. have been less lucky than Miss La Fontaine as regards the data at their disposal and have had to rely on inadequate, unsystematic and often old published material, but they have often still been able to produce volumes which were useful because of their comprehensive and annotated bibliographies, providing the reader with a helpful guide in his own researches. On this score, too, the volume under discussion is very disappointing. Its bibliography is neither comprehensive nor annotated; in fact it is very sketchy. Where in this bibliography are the 'mass of unpublished documents, reports and records in government files and in the archives of missionary societies' to which the editor refers? They are included in the bibliographies of other volumes, and they must surely exist for the Gisu? The writer does not mention any annual or other administrative reports either. From the text, however, one gets the impression that she did use them. For instance on p. 13 we are told that 'Perryman finally adjudicated (in a boundary dispute) in favour of Bugisu'. But there is no reference to the relevant literature. Similarly, the section on the pacification of Bugisu by the Ganda in 1900 and their role in the early days of British administration (p. 12), does not have one reference to the literature. Her information on the number of Christians in 1907 (p. 12), or the 'resistance and fear' with which the introduction of coffee and cotton was met (p. 59), does not mention any sources. And for the person who is interested in modern political and religious movements there is surely more than the one course which the writer quotes, on the Dini Ya Misambwa movement of the late

1940's? There are glaring gaps in the bibliography even as regards published sources: e.g. Hailey's volumes on British Administration; Meyreuil: *Dans l'Ugande, les Pays bugishu et bukedi*, 1909; the report on the coffee Co-op. of a few years ago; Purvis has only one book included, but not his *Through Uganda to Mount Elgon* (1909). Moreover, there is at least one source (*1948 Census of East Africa*) which is quoted in a footnote (p. 9) but not included in the bibliography. One regrets having to conclude that the text does not, to quote the editor again, 'present a clear account of our existing knowledge' (fortunately we know that this book does not represent Miss La Fontaine's existing knowledge) and that the bibliography is not comprehensive but slip-shod.

J. VAN VELSEN
University College of Rhodesia and Nyasaland
Salisbury

l'Empêchement de Parenté en Droit Coutumier Africain (Kinship Impediments in African Customary Law). J. VAN DRIESSCHE. Museum Lessianum, Section Missiologique No. 38, Descles de Brouwer, Louvain, Belgium. 1959. 312 pp., 6 kinship charts.

One of the major problems confronting Christian missions in their attempts to evangelize pre-literate peoples has been the clash of conflicting and apparently irreconcilable postulates in the field of marriage and the family. In the early period of missionary activity it was often believed that many Christian and 'pagan' ways of life were in absolute disagreement, that most 'pagan' customs and practices were suspect and intrinsically evil, and that the programme of missions was to eliminate such conflicting features.

However, a distinct change has been recognized in the philosophy of missions during the last two or three decades, and this is due not in small part to the ever-increasing recognition of the importance of social anthropology in all considerations of human relationships. J. Merle Davis reflects the conviction of most missionary executives when he states that "Social Anthropology . . . is indispensable to those who would understand an unfamiliar society and to no one is it more vital than to the missionary for, without such help, he is handicapped from the very beginning of his work." [1]

The book under review is an excellent example of the utilization of sound ethnology in missions. It is extraordinary, in the first place, because it is, as far as is known, the first and only systematic comparative study of the conflicts existing between African kinship systems and the Code of Canon Law. It is of importance, secondly, because it examines the problem of consanguineous marriages, a kinship phenomenon which has been the greatest obstacle to the spread of Catholic Missions in Africa.

For example, in reference to preferential cross-cousin marriages the Church has proclaimed an annulling restriction on all such unions up to the third degree of blood-relationship. However, DeLaere has compiled a list, which he declares to be incomplete, of thirty-six African tribes where this preferential marriage is customary. [2] The custom of the sororate and the levirate amongst many African tribes is an ancient and integral factor in their social structure, and here one is not speaking of the replacement of a sterile sister, or the inheritance by a man of a dead brother's wife, or the raising up of seed by a brother in his dead brother's name. Here reference is made only to marriages with the sister of a deceased wife, or the brother of a deceased husband. According to canon law, the Church places an annulling restriction on such unions, yet for many Africans they constitute a marriage of preference.

The book is important, furthermore, because of the thoroughness of its research and documentation. For example, over two hundred ancient and contemporary sources

[1] Davis, J. Merle, *New Buildings on Old Foundations* (International Missionary Council, New York, 1945) p. 47.
[2] DeLaere, J., "A propos des cousins croisés," in *Bulletin des Juridictions Indigènes et du Droit Coutumier Congolais*, Elisabethville, VIII, 7, 1950, pp. 197-215.

on the origins and reasons for restrictions on marriages in canon law have been examined.

Finally, the book strikes this reviewer as being uniquely important because, after examining aspects of conflict, it formulates suggested solutions which, while rational in adaptation and application to contemporary African customary law, seem at the same time to be sympathetic and loyal to the spirit of the Code of Canon Law.

The book is arranged in three sections: the first deals with basic principles of marriage regulations among African peoples, the second surveys the regulations in ecclesiastical law which prohibit consanguineous and affinal marriages, and the third section is composed of suggestions of adaptations of canon law with African customary law, in reference to prohibitions of such marriages.

Basing his first section on *African Systems of Kinship and Marriage*, edited by Radcliffe-Brown and Forde,[3] the author presents an analysis of the functional structure of kinship relationships in clan systems. Examining successively the classificatory nomenclature and kinship systems in Africa he postulates explanations for prohibited marriages, as well as preferential marriages, and illustrates his study by concrete examples amongst the Kongo. This section is made further useful by several detailed charts of typical kinship systems in Africa and elsewhere.

In his analysis of the juridical nature of prohibitions of consanguineous marriages, dealt with in the second section, the author seeks to discover the true motivations for such prohibitions. He then proceeds to present very interesting arguments which would justify an adaptation of ecclesiastical law in reference to marriage prohibitions, notably the already existing, and in certain cases widely applied, provision for granting dispensations of restrictions. And he asks, "Ought not the notion of consanguinity itself to be reviewed? Too often authorities in canon law seem to limit themselves to arguments provided by their predecessors, without having thought through these problems in the light of the progress of modern science: philosophically, theologically, morally, socially and biologically. Recognizing the rapid evolution of Christian communities on mission fields one might ask if the discipline in reference to prohibitions of certain types of indigenous marriages is not too impregnated with the spirit of the west."[4]

In the third section, where the author discusses the solution of problems posed, he causistically offers certain practical solutions to different typical cases, after having examined them systematically in terms of marriage types, ecclesiastical prohibitions of respective types, and reasons for this prohibition. The enquiry is concerned particularly with marriages between parents and children, between siblings, between parallel cousins, preferential cross-cousin marriages, preferential marriages between grandfather and grandchild, the sororate, the levirate, marriages of siblings in the same clan, and marriages between nephews and nieces or brothers and sisters.

A translation of this book into English would be highly commended, the work itself being of interest not only to canonists and missionaries but to ethnologists interested in practical anthropology. In such a translation, it would expand the book's usefulness if the numerous Latin texts and quotations could be footnoted in English.

As a review of African kinship systems, as well as a survey of types of marriages and suggested reasons for the various types, the book is a valuable source. As an example of a Catholic scholar, disengaging himself from purely dogmatic, traditional and static theological exercises and thrusting himself into dynamic cultural situations, both to evaluate critically and to proffer workable solutions, the book is probably unexcelled.

E. M. SHOLUND
Johannesburg

[3]One is puzzled by the fact that this book, used constantly as the major source of reference, is, with but one exception, referred to as 'the work' of Radcliffe-Brown, although he was but co-editor with Daryll Forde. Admittedly the inclusion of both names elongates a foot-note but the exclusion of one editor makes for an inexcusable, as well as an incorrect, reference.

[4]p. 237.

A Survey of North West Africa (The Maghrib). Edited by NEVILLE BARBOUR. Oxford University Press, London, 1959. Issued under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs. xi + 406 pp., 6 maps. 35s.

This is the first authoritative survey of North West Africa that has appeared in English, and in view of the tense situation in Algeria, the emergence of Libya, Tunisia and Morocco once more as independent, sovereign states, and the debatable future of Mauritania and the Saharan regions, its publication is most welcome.

There is a general Introduction, followed by a detailed discussion of the three major areas, the Western Maghrib, Algeria and the Sahara, and the Eastern Maghrib. The features of each territory are given under the headings Geography and Population, History, Government and Political Life, Social Conditions, and Economic Conditions.

The extensive Introduction deals with the remarkable succession of civilizing and uncivilizing influences on the land and on the autochthonous people, the Berbers, who live as agriculturists in solidly-built villages, and who have survived since the second millenium B.C. by adopting and absorbing the cultures of most of the peoples who have invaded their territories. First, the Phoenicians founded the colony of Carthage in 800 B.C., and then the Romans wielded influence a over North West Africa from 200 B.C. to 400 A.D. Almost a thousand years of Arab domination began in 642 A.D. with the overthrow of the Byzantine regime, and it was only in the latter part of the 16th Century that North West Africa began to go through a period of eclipse under loose and ineffective control from Turkey. The activities of the Barbary Corsairs gave the area a very bad name, but Mr Barbour is careful to point out that privateering was common everywhere at that time, and that the European Christian powers were no less guilty of piracy and the enslavement of captives than the North African Muslims.

In comparison with its long history of independence and sporadic foreign domination, the influence of France, Italy and Spain in North West African affairs has been relatively short-lived. The occupation of Algeria by France in 1830 was accompanied by much unnecessary cruelty; Tunisia was occupied rather more diplomatically in 1881 during the period of French Colonial expansion under Jules Ferry, and the occupation of Morocco in 1912 had a most auspicious beginning because of the character and outlook of Marshal Lyautey.

The nature and circumstances of the different French occupations are related to the subsequent patterns of history in the territories. The machinery of government in Morocco, the least developed of the three territories, was not radically altered by the French, but many technological innovations were made; Morocco was the first of the three to attain independence, in November, 1955, as a result of a movement in which the present monarch played an important part. Tunisia became independent in July, 1957, but the head of the state is a President and not a member of the old ruling family. The future of Algeria is still in the balance, and is especially complicated by the presence of a large number of non-Muslim settlers and the existence of the Algerian Sahara, which represents a land link between France and her West African possessions.

This book is sure to remain a standard work on the area for a long time to come, and therefore a few suggestions for changes in future editions are perhaps worth mentioning.

There is a certain lack of uniformity in the presentation of the material, which often makes comparison difficult; one does not expect to have the information printed in parallel columns, like the synoptic gospels, but at least such things as budget tables should be uniform; for instance the budget tables for Algeria and Tunisia (on pp. 248 and 338 respectively) are similar in layout, though we are starved for information on Algeria after 1956 and on Tunisia before 1956, but there is no comparable table for Morocco's budget. An appendix containing comparative tables for a number of relevant subjects would be an excellent addition to the book. Then again, there is considerable

unevenness in the quality and quantity of information given for each country; for instance, health and industry are given scant attention in the Tunisian section but well treated under Morocco and Algeria. Similarly, comparative figures for education are not always given for the same years nor for the same categories.

There is a certain amount of repetition in the text, which can be tiresome. It is stated both on page 34 (in the Introduction) and on page 211 (in the section on Algeria), that 14 out of 28 Algerian Deys died violently, and this is the sort of bizarre information that does not need to be mentioned twice in one book to make its impact on the memory of the reader. The repetition in the detailed sections of the book, of information that has been given in the Introduction, is perhaps understandable, but it is exasperating to be told twice within a few lines on page 202 that Algeria's three principal ports are Oran, Algiers and Bône, or this on page 203: "the present population of Algeria is of the order of 10 million"; then three lines later, "nine-tenths of the population are Muslim; their number has now reached about 9 million".

Such shortcomings do not seriously reduce the worth of the book, but more attention might be given to the problems of selection and presentation of the material before a further edition is printed.

JOHN BLACKING
University of the Witwatersrand
Johannesburg

Crops and Wealth in Uganda. C. C. WRIGLEY. East African Studies, No. 12. East African Institute of Social Research, Kampala. 1959.

This publication, in what is becoming a well-known series, is described as a short agrarian history of Uganda. It is in fact virtually the history of cotton, and latterly coffee, production in that territory and represents the results of an investigation undertaken in 1952-4 when the writer held a research fellowship at the East African Institute of Social Research.

It is a workmanlike, readable and well-documented survey. Its particular interest lies in its account of the recent economic history of a tropical, non-maritime, newly-discovered politically-dependent country. Uganda, according to the writer, is without doubt, one of the more favoured parts of Africa in terms of its geographic environment, and certain areas possess outstanding advantages for the raising of perennial crops.

The people of Uganda are sketched against this background and the beginnings of development from 1902 to 1914 described. Cotton obviously formed the foundations of Uganda's modern economy, a crop which in those days was not meeting with a comparable measure of success in other African territories. Most remarkable was that indigenous Africans should have taken so easily to the crop and to its production for the market and that in the course of time this peasant export economy should have ousted the European planters.

In tracing the latest phase of development the book underlines well an example of how indigenous peoples in Africa, generally known for their primitive subsistence agriculture, in Uganda, largely by their own efforts with smallholding and hoe, have successfully entered into the modern money economy. This development has not been without its difficulties but the book sketches a process that needs to be emulated in many other parts of Africa at this time.

T. J. D. FAIR
University of the Witwatersrand
Johannesburg